Polska Akademia Nauk
Instytut Historii
Polskie Towarzystwo Historyczne

KWARTALNIK HISTORYCZNY

Founded by Xawery Liske
in 1887

Vol. CXXI
2014

Special Issue

Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper
Warsaw 2014

This Publication has received additional funding
from the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Poland

Instytut Historii PAN
00-272 Warszawa, Rynek Starego Miasta 29/31, tel. +48 22 831 02 61
e-mail: kh@ihpan.edu.pl
http://www.ihpan.edu.pl
http://www.semper.pl/kwartalnik_historyczny

Editor of the English-Language Edition: Richard Butterwick-Pawlikowski
English-Language Editorial Assistant: Christopher Nicholson
Assistant Secretary to the Editorial Board: Monika Jusupović
General Assistant to the Editorial Board: Andrzej Skalimowski

PL ISSN 0023-5903
Nr indeksu 363103
The electronic version of this issue of the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* is the original version
The *Kwartalnik Historyczny* is a peer-reviewed journal

Wydawnictwo Naukowe Semper

Editorial board and Design studio:
ul. Mariensztat 8
00-302 Warsaw
tel./fax: 22 538 92 03
e–mail: redakcja@semper.pl

http://semper.pl
http://semper.istore.pl

Sales department and Bookstore:
ul. Bednarska 20 A
00-321 Warsaw
tel./fax: 22 828 49 73
e-mail: handlowy@semper.pl

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REVIEWS — POLEMICS — MATERIALS

REVIEW ARTICLES AND REVIEWS

*

Kwartalnik Historyczny
Vol. CXXI, 2014
Special Issue, pp. 5–6
PL ISSN 0023-5903

INTRODUCTION

The *Kwartalnik Historyczny* (Historical Quarterly) is the oldest Polish historical periodical. The first issue came out in 1887, published by the Polish Historical Society (PTH). Ever since it has been published without a break, except for a short period during the Second World War. During these many decades the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* has been an important forum for the exchange of ideas between Polish historians and one of the most consistently desired places for the publication of their research. The great majority of texts published in the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* have concerned the history of Poland — from the earliest times until the most recent. However, an important place has always been occupied by articles and reviews on the history of other parts of Europe and the World. Such articles have been published more frequently in recent years.

The language of publication in the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* is Polish. This is understandable given that the journal is the forum for intellectual exchange especially between Polish historians and the increasing number of foreign historians whose research chiefly concerns Poland, the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and its successor nations. Nevertheless History is becoming an ever more international and transnational discipline. Research on Polish history is increasingly important not only for the wider history of Europe and the World, but also for the history of neighbouring and other countries. It is beginning to interest those historians who are not specialists on Polish history, but who in their own studies do draw on the methods and results of research into the Polish past. Responding to this development, the editors of the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* have decided to publish the journal partly in English. It is hoped that alongside the normal four issues in Polish per annum, that in some years a longer English edition will also be published.

This issue of the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* mostly contains texts which were previously published in Polish issues,[1] but also four which were written especially for the English edition.[2] Several concern the history of Poland, which remains — despite the growing number of foreign scholars working on Polish history — patchily covered in Anglophone historiography. Several texts concern the history of other parts of the World: it is hoped that their publication in English will enable them to make their deserved impact on the historiography of those countries and regions. We believe that the texts assembled here represent some of the best work currently being done, both by Polish historians and by historians working on Poland, and we are pleased to offer it to the worldwide community of scholars.

Roman Michałowski and Richard Butterwick-Pawlikowski

This, the first English-language edition of the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* was selected and edited in close co-operation with the School of Slavonic and East European Studies at University College London. Responsibility for the editing was taken on by Richard Butterwick-Pawlikowski, one of the deputy editors of the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* and Professor of Polish-Lithuanian History at UCL-SSEES. The English-language texts were checked and corrected by Dr Christopher Nicholson, a graduate of the School. In the name of the editorial board of the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* I warmly thank them and the Director of the School, Professor Slavo Radošević, for their co-operation.

Roman Michałowski, Editor-in-Chief

[1] The article by Marcin R. Pauk was first published in *KH* 119, 2012, 3, pp. 467–506; the article by Paweł T. Dobrowolski in *KH* 120, 2013, 3, pp. 425–47, the article by Maciej Górny in KH 118, 2011, 4, pp. 681–706; the review articles by Halina Manikowska and Richard Butterwick-Pawlikowski both in *KH* 117, 2010, 1, pp. 49–55 and pp. 63–76. The book review by Jerzy Strzelczyk has been published in *KH* 117, 2010, 1, pp. 102–04, by Grzegorz Pac in *KH* 117, 2010, 4, pp. 111–15 and by Edward Opaliński in *KH* 118, 2011, 4, pp. 707–24 (as review article).

[2] These are the articles written by Michał Tymowski, Paweł Duber, and Rafał Stobiecki, and the book review by Andrzej Janicki.

Kwartalnik Historyczny
Vol. CXXI, 2014
Special Issue, pp. 7–48
PL ISSN 0023-5903

MARCIN RAFAŁ PAUK
Institute of History, University of Warsaw

THE COIN IN THE POLITICAL CULTURE OF THE MIDDLE AGES. ON THE ICONOGRAPHY OF THE BOHEMIAN DENIERS IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE TWELFTH CENTURY

What were the ideas and motives that stood behind the selection of designs to be stamped on coins manufactured by moneyers on commission from both lay and ecclesiastical members of the medieval elite? Did the latter rely for that selection on the most popular iconographic motifs — some traditional *topoi* — originating in antiquity and typifying Western Christianity? Or, perhaps were they willing to shape their iconographic message in such a way that it remained in tune with the prevailing political situation? And if they found it well-advised to use coins as a vehicle with which to 'recount' political events, were they, then, drawing on some universal symbols and metaphors?[1] These are common problems facing specialists in the field of medieval numismatics. Coins, however, have only rarely been treated as primary sources by scholars involved in the exploration of other aspects of medieval history and culture. Few attempts have been made to analyse the role of medieval coinage in political life,[2] and whatever answers one might want to give to the questions posed above, there seems to be no doubt that coins in the Middle Ages served as the most widely used means of communication between

[1] Stanisław Suchodolski, 'Czy wyobrażenia na monetach odzwierciedlają rzeczywistość, czy ją kreują. Przykład monety polskiej w średniowieczu', in *Dzieło sztuki: źródło ikonograficzne czy coś więcej. Materiały Sympozjum XVII Powszechnego Zjazdu Historyków w Krakowie, 15–18 września 2004*, ed. Marcin Fabiański, Warsaw, 2005, pp. 45–66. For more on the problem of the *historical* versus the topical character of coin images see Witold Garbaczewski, 'Topos na monetach średniowiecznych. Przykład czeski i morawski', *Folia Numismatica (Supplementum Ad Acta Musei Moraviae, Scientie Sociales)*, 25, 2011, 2, pp. 77–97.

[2] Ryszard Kiersnowski, *Moneta w kulturze wieków średnich*, Warsaw, 1988.

the rulers and the ruled. As such, they were a very convenient tool employed in the dissemination of 'propagandistic' discourse which crystallized existing power relations.[3] The frequent issuing of coins in the period from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries provided rulers with opportunities to modify ideological and political messages — transmitted as images on the coins — in a way which made it more consistent with the current political developments. There is also no denying that one's ability to offer a sound and well-founded interpretation of monetary iconography depends on an extensive knowledge of the religious and political culture of the Middle Ages. A knowledge of medieval numismatics itself may not suffice for one to steer clear of dubious conclusions and obvious misinterpretations.

The collection of Bohemian and Moravian numismatic artifacts of the denier period stands out from other Central European collections. Rich in iconographic motifs, the coins of the period are of an extremely high artistic standard.[4] So far, however, there has been no attempt to subject them to a thorough analysis.[5] Historians whose interest does not lie specifically in the history of money have made only very limited use of the deniers in the study of other topics. The coinage of the twelfth century seems to provide an exceptional amount of historical evidence and an examination of these coins is likely to result in a greater understanding of certain aspects of the political and religious culture of the period — especially those bound up with the emblems of royal power.[6]

Many years ago Emanuela Nohejlová-Prátová, focusing her attention on some of the deniers analysed below, expressed the opinion that the

[3] For comparison, see the felicitous remarks on the term 'political propaganda' in Peter Burke, *Fabrykacja Ludwika XIV*, Warsaw, 2011, pp. 17–19 (English edition: *The Fabrication of Louis XIV*, Yale, 1992).

[4] Throughout the paper I rely on a catalogue listing of the early medieval Bohemian coins prepared by František Cach, *Nejstarší české mince*, 3 vols, Prague 1970–74, vol. 2: *České a moravské denáry od mincovni reformy Břetislava I. do doby brakteátově*, 1972 (hereafter Cach); see also Jan Šmerda, *Denáry české a moravské. Katalog mincí českého státu od X. do počátku XIII. století*, Brno, 1996; the Moravian coinage has recently been analysed in a full-length book: Jan Videman and Josef Paukert, *Moravské denáry 11.–12. století*, Kroměříž, 2009.

[5] On the problem of the Polish coinage in the period of feudal disintegration see Witold Garbaczewski, *Ikonografia monet piastowskich 1173–ok. 1280*, Warsaw and Lublin, 2007.

[6] Stanisław Suchodolski, 'Czy władcy polscy we wczesnym średniowieczu posługiwali się jabłkiem panowania?', in *Kultura średniowieczna i staropolska. Studia ofiarowane Aleksandrowi Gieysztorowi w pięćdziesięciolecie pracy naukowej*, ed. Danuta Gawinowa et al., Warsaw, 1991, pp. 251–59; idem, 'Włócznia świętego Stefana', *KH*, 112, 2005, 3, pp. 91–110; Bogumiła Haczewska, 'Insygnia koronacyjne na monetach polskich w okresie rozbicia dzielnicowego', in *Nummus et historia. Pieniądz Europy średniowiecznej*, ed. Stefan K. Kuczyński and Stanisław Suchodolski, Warsaw, 1985, pp. 119–29.

pioneers of Czech numismatics had been guilty of ascribing too close a relationship between the images on coins and the contemporary political conditions.[7] With time, however, this tendency gave way to a view that linked the images that began to appear on deniers at the turn of the eleventh and twelfth centuries with a more universal message — one replete with Christian symbolism.[8] Despite the controversy which the discussion of the meaning of coin iconography is always certain to trigger and the caution one is advised to exercise in putting forward its interpretation, attempts at relating the iconography to specific events have continued. For example, a denier of Vladislaus I featuring a warrior holding a captive on a leather strap — an event described in the chronicle of Cosmas — has recently been interpreted by Luboš Polanský as commemorating the liberation of Christian slaves who had been bought out of Jewish slavery. In order to obtain the financial means needed to set these Christians free, the duke was to confiscate everything that had belonged to a Jewish 'financier' and apostate Jacob Apella.[9] However, in pursuing this interpretation, the author failed to see that the slave, tied up with a leather strap wrapped around his neck and begging for mercy, has much more to do with a gesture of domination and submission than of liberation and deliverance. One is then tempted to answer the author in Horace's phrase '*credit Iudaeus Apella, non ego*', which in itself could serve here as a good point of departure for the discussion of the classical education Cosmas must have received. It is, then, only royal coins that one is justified in treating as connected with specific events. The coins were designed to symbolize the acquisition of the new insignia by the ruler. Even in this case, however, it remains open to debate whether the issue of new coins (like, for example, the 'coronation' deniers of Vratislaus II issued in 1086 or those minted in the name of Vladislaus II in 1158) were supposed to commemorate the coronation ceremony itself or — without implying that their issue is to be treated as inseparable from the sacred act of coronation — inform the subjects of a new status to which their

[7] Emanuela Nohejlová-Prátová, 'Přispěvek k tematice obrazů na českých denárech 12. století', *Sborník Národního muzea v Praze*, ser. A — Historie, 31, 1967, p. 214; see also Jarmila Hásková, *Česká mince v době románské. Příspěvek k ikonografii českých denárů 10.–12. století*, Cheb, 1975, pp. 14–15.

[8] Pavel Radoměrský, 'Peníze Kosmova věku (1050–1125)', *Numizmatický časopis*, 21, 1952, p. 37.

[9] *Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Boemorum*, ed. Berthold Bretholz, in *MGH SrG n.s.*, vol. 2, Berlin, 1923, book III/75, pp. 231–32; Luboš Polanský, 'Kníže a otrok. K ikonografii denáru knížete Vladislava I', in *Na prahu poznaní českých dějin. Sborník prací k poctě Jiřího Slamy*, Prague, 2006, *Studia Mediaevalia Pragensia*, vol. 9, pp. 103–11; Garbaczewski also treats the concept sceptically, see 'Topos na monetach', p. 84.

ruler, now the king, had been elevated.[10] Polanský also tried to interpret a denier of Soběslaus I as representing a specific political event — the enthronement of the duke in Prague in 1125.[11] The difficult question which arises here is whether his installation as the new ruler went hand in hand with the substitution of new dies for those used by his predecessors and, therefore, with the minting of deniers with new images. It is also difficult to ascertain whether the deniers were issued only with a view to marking the inauguration of his reign. Cosmas explains that money was tossed out at the crowd to prevent it from pressing in on the duke-elect, but this is not evidence that the coins were struck specifically to mark the occasion, or that their iconography had anything to do with the event.[12] However, it seems that — *quod est demonstrandum* — by giving priority to 'symbolic' interpretation over its 'historical' counterpart, one runs the risk of throwing the baby out with the bath water.

As Stanisław Suchodolski rightly remarked,[13] historians who are not experts in numismatics rarely turn to coins as iconographic sources. But in fact numismatic sources have an indisputably important role to play in the study of the ideology of power, as well as the political and religious culture of the Middle Ages. The purpose of this paper is to offer a reinterpretation of the meaning of several Bohemian numismatic artifacts from the first half of the twelfth century. Each of them has been widely com-

[10] Cach, no. 355, 600, 601; Jarmila Hásková, 'K ikonografii českých mincí Vratislava II.', in *Královský Vyšehrad. Sborník příspěvků k 900. výročí úmrtí prvního českého krále Vratislava II. (1061–1092)*, Prague, 1992, pp. 59–68, especially pp. 65–67; Luboš Polanský and Michal Mašek, 'Ikonografie ražeb a stručný přehled mincovnictví Vladislava II.', in *Vladislav II., druhý král z Přemyslova rodu. K 850. výročí jeho korunovace*, ed. Michal Mašek, Petr Sommer and Josef Žemlička, Prague, 2009, pp. 116–24, especially pp. 119–20; Zdeněk Petráň, 'Denár Vladislava II z nápisy', in *Pavel Radoměrský. Sborník numismatických studií k 75. výročí narození*, ed. Luboš Polanský, Prague, 2002, pp. 22–28; Zdeněk Petráň and Michal Mašek, 'Tzv. nápisový denár Vladislava II. v historických souvislostech', in *Vladislav II., druhý král z Přemyslova rodu*, pp. 125–33.

[11] Luboš Polanský, 'Nálezy mincí na Pražském hradě a počátky vlády Soběslava I. (1125–1140)', in *Dějiny ve věku nejistot. Sborník k příležitosti 70. narozenin Dušana Třeštíka*, ed. Jan Klapště, Eva Plešková, Josef Žemlička, Prague, 2003, pp. 220–30; I discuss the validity of this interpretation in a later part of this paper.

[12] *Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Boemorum*, book I/42, p. 78: 'et sicut semper in electione ducis faciunt, per superioris aule cancellos decem milia nummorum aut plus per populum spargunt, ne ducem in solio comprimant, sed potius sparsos nummos rapiant'. A detailed account of the custom included in the chronicle appears to have a clearly rationalizing character, obscuring the sense of this distribution. At any rate, the chronicler's account does not allow us to draw the conclusion that the coins used were those minted especially to mark the occasion, the view held for example by Petráň and Mašek ('Tzv. nápisový denár Vladislava II.', p. 126). However, it is not impossible that the coins were in fact issued.

[13] Suchodolski, 'Czy wyobrażenia na monetach', p. 45.

mented upon by scholars. I will try to approach the subject from the perspective of political and religious ideology. Specifically, I shall try to shed some light on the meaning of the images on the coins in question by juxtaposing them with our knowledge of the cult of patron saints and the function it exercised, the significance which rulers' church foundation activities had for the creation of their public image, and the role that oaths and the conception of *mir* (peace) played in political communities.

1. 'In amorem sancti Wenceslai'

Czech historiography relies on political interpretation for the elucidation of the meaning of an iconographic programme inherent in three types of deniers from the first half of the twelfth century. The deniers show a figure proffering a cup to the king seated on the throne. The scene first appears on the reverse of a coin of Duke Svatopluk from 1107–09 (il. I.1). A figure standing on the right seems to be handing a goblet to the enthroned ruler. The latter is devoid of the insignia of royal power, with the exception of a long cane with a cross on top.[14] Most scholars tend to link the image with political events: the seated figure is considered to represent King Henry V, while the person handing him the goblet is the Bohemian duke Svatopluk. The denier's iconographic programme is believed to be bound up with the act of conferring on Svatopluk the title of the Reich's Arch-Cupbearer.[15] The duke was Henry V's closest ally during the conflicts with Poland and Hungary in the years 1108–09, but the confirmation of his appointment as Arch-Cupbearer is absent from the written sources. One is left with no other option but to accept the fact that the coin is possibly the only source of information about the event. However, in the accounts of some historians the elevation of Svatopluk to a position of imperial Cupbearer is not treated as a hypothesis only, but as a confirmed fact about which there can be no doubt, while the denier in question is, by extension, regarded as proof that coins were used for 'commenting' on the politics of the period.[16] The performance of this honourable service in the Emperor's presence by a Bohemian ruler is mentioned in the so-called *Reichschronik* written at the beginning of the twelfth century, the anonymous author of which had been wrongly identified as the chronicler Ekkehard of Aura. However, the

[14] Cach, no. 460; also Radoměrský, 'Peníze Kosmova věku', p. 93.

[15] Nohejlová-Prátová, 'Příspěvek k tematice', pp. 216–17; eadem, *Krasa české mince*, Prague, 1955, pp. 62–63. Doubts concerning this interpretation have recently been raised by Vratislav Vaníček, *Soběslav I. Přemyslovci v kontextu evropských dějin v letech 1092–1140*, Prague and Litomyšl, 2007, p. 96.

[16] See, for example, Petráň and Mašek, 'Tzv. nápisový denár Vladislava II.', pp. 125–26.

Bohemian ruler referred to in the chronicle is not Svatopluk but his direct successor Vladislaus I (1110–25). The Bohemian duke as *sumus pincerna* was to be entrusted with the task of serving Henry V at the table during the wedding feast organized to celebrate the latter's marriage to Matilda, the daughter of Henry I of England at Mainz in 1114.[17] That the chronicler decided to mention this fact proves that the service rendered by the duke was the exception rather than the rule and that it was not a task he should be assumed to have carried out on a regular basis. Neighbouring rulers allied with the Reich, or considered to have an important role to play in furtherance of the Reich's interests were sometimes — provided they did not aspire to become equal in status to the Emperor — entrusted with the task of performing this honourable service at court. But it must have been as rare an occurrence for Vladislaus I to perform a ceremonial duty of offering drinks to Henry V as it was for Boleslaus the Wrymouth to serve as sword-bearer to the Emperor Lothar III at the Merseburg Convention in 1135.[18]

In two deniers minted later by Soběslaus (1125–40), the scene assumes a slightly different character (il. II). One no longer gets an impression that the standing figure is handing a goblet to the seated person. What one can see here is the raising of the goblet in an upward direction, which looks more like a toast than the act of proffering an object. Clad in a tunic, with a sword in the right hand and propped against the shoulder, the figure seated on the throne is raising his left hand in a blessing-like gesture.[19] This scene, too, has been connected to the office of butler of the Reich.[20] Only Anežka Merhautová and Dušan Třeštík have advocated a different view; they have tried to identify the sitting person as St Wenceslaus and the man handing him the goblet as his servant Podiven.[21]

---

[17] *Anonymi chronica imperatorum Heinrico V. dedicata*, in *Frutolfs und Ekkehards Chroniken und die Anonyme Kaiserchronik*, ed. Franz-Josef Schmale and Irene Schmale-Ott, Darmstadt, 1972, *Ausgewählte Quellen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters. Freiherr von Stein-Gedächtnisausgabe*, vol. 15, p. 262.

[18] See Zbigniew Dalewski, 'Zjazd w Merseburgu w 1135 roku', in *Ludzie. Kościół. Wierzenia. Studia z dziejów kultury i społeczeństwa Europy Środkowej (średniowiecze — wczesna epoka nowożytna)*, ed. Wacław Iwańczak and Stefan K. Kuczyński, Warsaw, 2001, pp. 429–43, including a thorough analysis of the ideological significance of the ceremony of bearing the imperial sword in the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries (also idem, '"Lictor imperatoris". Kaiser Lothar III., Soběslav I. von Böhmen und Bolesław III. von Polen auf dem Hoftag in Merseburg im Jahre 1135', *Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung*, 50, 2001, pp. 317–36).

[19] Cach, no. 570.

[20] Nohejlová-Prátová, 'Přispěvek k tematice', p. 216.

[21] Anežka Merhautová and Dušan Třeštík, *Ideové proudy v českém umění 12. století*, Prague, 1985, p. 92.

There are many weaknesses to be found in attempts to link the deniers' iconographic programme with the Reich's cupbearer. In the first place, this interpretation is hampered by serious doubts that can be raised as to whether the permanent office of imperial Cupbearer — to be hereditarily held by Bohemian rulers — could exist as early as the first half of the twelfth century. A semantic analysis of monetary images also makes this interpretation implausible. Scholars are often inclined to express serious objections to the view that the Reich's hereditary offices, whose holders reigned over particular territorial principalities and enjoyed the right to elect German kings, existed before the thirteenth century.[22] Moreover, the fact that Czech narrative sources remain silent on this point seems to be no accident. One may also have some doubts about the way in which the deniers' images have so far been viewed, with the interpretation of the oldest of them, the denier of Svatopluk, being particularly dubious. This denier distinguishes itself by a small detail which has escaped scholars' attention or has simply failed to be recognized as having any importance for the interpretation of the whole image:[23] there is a third person to be discerned between the alleged Emperor and the Bohemian ruler (il. I.2). Standing near the shaft of the cross held by the Emperor, the person is much smaller than the two remaining figures. This third character is not trying to hold up the cross, as can be inferred from the depiction of the coin,[24] but is making a gesture which seems to be an imitation of the gesture made by the duke. He is raising a rectangular object in which I am

[22] See especially Zdeněk Fiala, 'Vztah českého státu k Německé říši do počátku 13. století', *Sborník historický*, 6, 1959, p. 80; Ivan Hlaváček, 'Die böhmische Kurwürde in den Přemyslidenzeit', in *Königliche Tochterstämme, Königswähler und Kurfürsten*, ed. Armin Wolf, Frankfurt am Main, 2002, pp. 79–106; Hartmut Hoffmann, 'Böhmen und das Deutsche Reich im hohen Mittelalter', *Jahrbuch für die Geschichte des Mittel- und Ostdeutschlands*, 18, 1969, pp. 34–37. Recently Alexander Begert, ignoring justified doubts raised by Hartmut Hoffmann, and Czech scholars, has supported the view that Bohemian rulers held the office hereditarily as early as the beginning of the twelfth century: *Böhmen, die böhmische Kur und das Reich vom Hochmittelalter bis zum Ende des Alten Reiches. Studien zur Kurwürde und zur staatsrechtlichen Stellung Böhmens*, Husum, 2003, *Historische Studien*, vol. 475, pp. 62–63. On the office and title of Arch-Cupbearer in the twelfth century, but without any reference to numismatic evidence, see: Martin Wihoda, 'Česká knížata na dvorských sjezdech', in *Rituály, ceremonie a festivity ve Střední Evropě 14. a 15. století*, ed. Martin Nodl and František Šmahel, Prague, 2009, *Colloquia mediaevalia Pragensia*, vol. 12, pp. 197–98.

[23] See, for example, Hlaváček, 'Die böhmische Kurwürde', p. 85: 'Die bedeutend kleinere dritte Gestalt ist für die Szene belangslos, da sie nur das Bild ausfüllt bzw. die Lanze halten hilft'.

[24] This line of reasoning is followed, for example, by Radoměrský, 'Peníze Kosmova věku', p. 93.

inclined to see a goblet or a cup.[25] This means, however, that the scene which is believed to be representing the performance of a ceremonial duty by a cup-bearer serving a drink to the Emperor is — in view of the third person 'doubling' the same ritual act — no longer understandable. The fact that the figures shown on the coin have different heights needs to be regarded as expressing a standard way in which different social ranks were represented in medieval iconography. The legend on the reverse of the coin is also at odds with the scene allegedly showing a cup-bearer performing his royal household duty.[26] The legend contains the inscription +VVENCEZLAVS. It is for this reason that the identification of the enthroned figure as St Wenceslaus appears to be convincing. However, the image is not a typical devotional scene. It is easy to see that the smaller figures — that is, the duke with a goblet in his hand raised towards the saint and his feast companion who, following the *pars pro toto* principle, is probably representing all the Bohemian nobles and who is also keeping his cup raised in a toast-like gesture — are shown just drinking a toast to the saint. The scene has even greater semantic clarity on Soběslaus I's deniers where there can be no doubt that the ruler, facing the saint, is raising a goblet in a toast gesture. But to further clarify the problem under discussion, it seems necessary to take a closer look at the ritual of toasting a saint as it existed in the religious and political culture of the Middle Ages.

There is much historical evidence available regarding the medieval rite of raising a toast in a saint's honour.[27] The information about the rite dates back to Carolingian times and is bound up with feasting customs of guilds and *coniurationes* which the Church tried to eradicate and priests were strictly prohibited from taking part in.[28] In the tenth and

[25] Because of the small size of the figures involved, the shape can easily be recognized only in the well-preserved coins, see Nohejlová-Prátová, 'Přispěvek k tematice', tab. II.

[26] This has already been discerned by Nohejlová-Prátová ('Přispěvek k tematice', p. 215), although it needs to be said that the discrepancy between a coin image and its legend occurs quite often in the early medieval coinage. See Stanisław Suchodolski, 'Obraz i słowo na monetach Europy Środkowej, Północnej i Wschodniej w X i XI wieku', in idem, *Numizmatyka średniowieczna. Moneta źródłem archeologicznym, historycznym i ikonograficznym*, Warsaw, 2012, pp. 381–91.

[27] Ch. Zimmermann, 'Minnetrinken', in *Reallexicon der germanischen Altertumskunde*, ed. Heinrich Beck et. al., 35 vols, Berlin and New York, 1970–2007, vol. 20, 2002, pp. 49–56. Typology of this kind of cult behavior including the form it took across the whole medieval Europe has competently been prepared by Hedwig Schommer, 'Die Heiligenminne als kirchlicher und volkstümlicher Brauch', *Rheinisches Jahrbuch für Volkskunde*, 5, 1954, pp. 184–231.

[28] For example the bans contained in the Capitulary of Hinkmar of Reims: *MGH Capitula episcoporum*, vol. 2, ed. Rudolf Pokorny and Martina Stratmann, Hanover, 1995,

eleventh centuries the Church's unfavourable attitude towards the idea of toasting a saint gave way to its full acceptance by different social circles, including the clergy. The change is clearly attested to by the frequent mention of the rite in monastic historiography, hagiographic literature,[29] and even in books of monastic rules from Western Europe.[30] Vivid depictions of the custom *potus caritatis* are to be found in early medieval texts devoted to St Ulrich of Augsburg and St Emmeram of Regensburg. Given the fact that the Bohemian lands fell under the powerful influence of Christianity radiating from Bavaria, and because of the early dissemination of the cults of St Ulrich and St Emmeram within the Přemyslid state, the texts are worth closer examination. St Ulrich's hagiographer, Gerhard of Augsburg, writing an account of Ulrich's life and the miracles taking place right after the saint's death, devoted much space to the liturgical services conducted by the bishop of Augsburg. After the celebration of the Easter liturgy the bishop, says the chronicler, used to feast with his guests — cathedral canons and collegiate convent of St Afra. In an atmosphere of joyful singing, the bishop, along with his feast companions, performed at each table the rite of drinking a toast *pro caritate*.[31] When dealing with the saint's miracles, the hagiographer made several references to raising a toast in honour of the saint. The toast *pro amore* or *pro caritate sancti Uodalrici* was supposed to help one extricate oneself from all troubles. It was also supposed to ensure protection against any bodily harm.[32] Refusal to perform the ritual would result in swift punishment, such as breaking one's leg, falling off a horse,

---

cap. 13, p. 41: 'Ut nullus presbiterorum, quando ad anniversariam diem vel tricesimam, tertiam vel septimam alicuius defuncti aut quacumque vocatione ad collectam presbyteri convenerint, se inebriare presumat nec precari in honore sanctorum vel ipsius animę bibere aut alios ad bibendum cogere'; Otto Gerhard Oexle, 'Średniowieczne gildie: ich tożsamość oraz wkład w formowanie się struktur społecznych', in: idem, *Społeczeństwo średniowiecza. Mentalność — grupy społeczne — formy życia*, Toruń, 2000, pp. 75–97, especially pp. 84–85; Gerd Althoff, 'Der frieden-, bündnis- und gemeinschaftstiftende Charakter des Mahles im früheren Mittelalter', in *Essen und Trinken in Mittelalter und Neuzeit*, ed. Irmgard Bitsch, Trude Ehlert and Xenja von Ertzdorff, Sigmaringen, 1987, pp. 17–19; M. Sierck, *Festtag und Politik. Studien zu Tagewahl karolingischer Herrscher*, Cologne, Weimar and Vienna, 1995, pp. 25–26.

[29] See, for example, Miracles of St Benedict by monks of Fleury — *Les Miracles de Saint Benoît*, ed. Eugène de Certain, Paris, 1858, book III, p. 139.

[30] For more on the issue of drinking *pro caritate* in monastic circles see Jörg Sonntag, *Klosterleben im Spiegel des Zeichenhaften*, Berlin, 2008, pp. 327–34.

[31] Gerhard von Augsburg, *Vita Sancti Uodalrici. Die älteste Lebensbeschreibung des Heiligen Ulrich*, ed. Walter Berschin and Angelika Häse, Heidelberg, 1993, book I/4, pp. 134–36 (I wish to thank Professor Roman Michałowski for letting me have the newest edition of the source).

[32] Ibid., book II/10–11, pp. 352–56.

or even having one's voice turned into a dog's bark.[33] The dissemination of the rite in Bavaria is illustrated by a colourful story included in a book of St Emmeram's miracles written by Arnold of St Emmeram. The book is in fact a kind of monastic chronicle. It also explains a punishment to be inflicted on those who ventured to treat the custom with disregard and mockery. The hagiographer gives an account of Emperor Otto I's stay at the Abbey of St Emmeram in whose honour the bishop of Regensburg and St Emmeram's abbot, Michael, gave a dinner. At the end of the feast the Emperor Otto supposedly stated that eating St Emmeram's food required a toast in his honour: 'Invigorated by food and in high spirits, people attending the dinner were addressed by the Emperor who said: he who drinks somebody's wine should also sing his song. We have eaten St Emmeram's food and we have drunk his wine. Now it is only right and proper for us to raise a toast in his honour'.[34] Then, at the Emperor's order, cup-bearers filled the guests' cups so that they could drink a toast to honour the saint, and embrace one another with the holy kiss. One of those in attendance, however, who had already become drunk, refused to raise a toast saying that his stomach was already full of food and drink. The blasphemer was instantaneously punished. Even though he sat leaning against the wall, the offended saint hit him so hard that he flew right into the middle of the room.[35] Impressed by the miracle, the Emperor Otto, in the company of the clergymen and nobles, went to the church to say a prayer to the patron of the monastery. The toast raised in the martyr's honour was referred to by the chronicler as *potum caritatis*. The chronicler stressed the fact that it was the ruler himself who initiated the toast and that it was this toast that ended the feast. It is clear that Otto's conduct was similar to that of bishop Udalric during the Easter celebration. In addition to raising a toast, both the laity and clergy honoured a saint by singing.[36] Sometimes they also gave

[33] Ibid., book II/12–13, pp. 356–60.

[34] 'Cumque ritu epulantium pene forent confirmati et laetati, imperator saxonizans dicit: Siceram cuius quis bibit, huius et carmen canat. Beati Emmerammi bona manducavimus ac bibimus, inde mihi videtur aequum, karitate eius finiri convivium'.

[35] *Ex Arnoldi libris de S. Emmerammo*, ed. Georg Waitz, in *MGH SS*, vol. 4, Hanover, 1841, book I, p. 552.

[36] Probably of Aquitanian origin, inserted in the tenth century into the codex kept presently in the Vatican Library, the so-called *Carmina Potatoria* are a special testimony to the performance of such songs. This is also where one can find a song in Archangel Michael's honour: *MGH Poetae latini aevi Carolini*, vol. 4, fasc. 1, ed. Paulus von Winterfeld, Berlin, 1899, pp. 350–53. See also Bernhard Bischoff, 'Caritas — Lieder', in idem, *Mittelalterliche Studien*, 3 vols, Stuttgart, 1966–81, vol. 2, 1967, pp. 56–77, and Wolfgang Haubrichs, 'Heiligenfest und Heiligenlieder im frühen Mittelalter. Zur Genese mündlicher und literarischer Formen in einer Kontaktzone laikaler und klerikaler

each other the kiss of peace. By refusing to perform the rite, which amounted to turning one's back on one's own community and disavowing the patron's sacred power, one ran the risk of insulting the saint and suffering the consequences of one's misconduct.[37]

This quasi-liturgical form of veneration of a saint was also known in the Bohemian lands. A famous motif found in the oldest Latin version of the Life of St Wenceslaus[38] can be adduced here in support of this opinion. The motif also appears in a version of the legend *Crescente fide*[39] which is now known to scholars. It was presented in greatest detail by Gumpold, the bishop of Mantua,[40] and its abbreviated form was also included in the

Kultur', in *Feste und Feiern im Mittelalter*, ed. Detlef Altenburg, Jörg Jarnut, Hans Hugo Steinhoff, Sigmaringen, 1991, pp. 133–43.

[37] The same motif is also present in the nineteenth-century *Miracula sancti Columbani* (ed. H. Bresslau, in *MGH SS*, vol. 30, part 2, Leipzig, 1934, cap. 21, pp. 1007–08), where Italian lords illegally occupying the land owned by the monastery of Bobbio were forced in the presence of King Hugo to drink a liquor from the cup of St Columbanus provided by the abbot of the monastery. The gesture can be interpreted as the expression of peace concluded by the lords with the Monastery and the ruler, or as a formal surrender of illegally held property. However, the two main culprits — Guy, the bishop of Piacenza, and his brother Reiner — refused to drink, surreptitiously abandoning the party, 'obliti sunt enim foedus, quod pepigerant regi'. The second of them soon fell off a horse, which was the punishment he had to suffer for his refusal to drink the liquor. The same source also mentioned the healing effect of drinking from the cup of St Columbanus. (I wish to thank Professor Jacek Banaszkiewicz for drawing my attention to this text).

[38] See: Joanna Sobiesiak, 'Książę Wacław na uczcie — książę Wacław gospodarz', in *Persona, gestus, habitusque insignium. Zachowania i atrybuty jako wyznacznik tożsamości społecznej jednostki w średniowieczu*, ed. Jacek Banaszkiewicz, Jacek Maciejewski and Joanna Sobiesiak, Lublin, 2009, pp. 47–56. On the problem of the chronology of the oldest version of the Life of St Wenceslaus see Dušan Třeštík, *Počátky Přemyslovců. Vstup Čechů do dějin (530–935)*, Prague, 1997; recently the problem has also been dealt with by Agnieszka Kuźmiuk-Ciekanowska, *Święty i historia. Dynastia Przemyślidów i jej bohaterowie w dziele mnicha Krystiana*, Kraków, 2007; Joanna Nastalska-Wiśnicka, *Rex martyr. Studium źródłoznawcze nad legendą hagiograficzną św. Wacława (X–XIV w.)*, Lublin, 2010, pp. 23–65.

[39] *Crescente fide české recense. Legenda o sv. Václavu z polovice X. století*, ed. Václav Chaloupecký, in *Prameny X. století legendy Kristiánovy o svatém Václavu a svaté Ludmile*, ed. Karel Guth et al., Prague, 1939, *Svatováclavský sborník*, vol. 2, part 2, p. 500: 'Accipiensque calicem intrepidus coram omnibus alta voce ait: "In nomine beati Michaelis archangeli bibemus calicem istum precantes, ut introducat animas nostras in pacem exultationis perpetue, amen!"'.

[40] *Gumpoldi Mantuani episcopi passio sancti Venceslai martyris*, ed. Josef Emler, in *Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum*, 8 vols, Prague, 1873–1935, vol. 1, p. 159: 'Et paulo post amota mensa surgit, impletaque vino patera, modestae salutacionis dicto, omnes huiusmodi alloquitur: "Salutet vos salus omnium Christus! Calicem, quem manu teneo, in sancti archangeli Michaelis amorem ebibere, unumquemque nostrum ne pigeat, hoc amore spiritalitatis eius altitudinem pro posse venerantes, ut quacumque hora lex naturae ad extrema nos deduxerit, animarum nostrarum paratus susceptor clemensque in paradisi voluptates dignetur fieri subvector, cordium imis precemur!". Statimque post

so-called *Christian's legend*.[41] Duke Wenceslaus, attending the feast to which he was invited by his brother Boleslaus the Cruel, raised a goblet and drank from it '*in amorem sancti archangeli Michaelis*' — whose eve was celebrated on the anniversary of the duke-martyr's death — exchanging with others the kiss of peace. The ritual's purpose, as the duke himself explained in a short speech, was to secure St Michael's favour. Upon the duke's death the saint was to speak in his defence in Heaven. However, placed within the framework of the hagiographic narrative, the motif was used to announce the swift fulfillment of the future martyr's fate[42]. It also dramatized the circumstances in which the royal saint died; for his brother, through ordering his assassination, brutally violated *mir* implied in a common feast, in a toast to the Archangel, and in the exchange of the kiss of peace. The scene representing a toast in St Michael's honour constituted so important an element in the structure of the hagiographic narrative that its pictorial version appeared in a famous illuminated manuscript of the Gumpold Legend from the turn of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The manuscript was probably prepared on a commission from the princess Emma, Boleslaus II's wife. It is now kept in the Herzog August Bibliothek at Wolfenbüttel (il. III).[43]

According to Petr Sommer, who relies on older literature, the legends of St Wenceslaus need to be seen as manifesting a Christianized rite which

---

verbum laetus ebibit, singillatim omnibus eodem amore singulos scyphos ebibendos blandissimo propinat osculo. Intrepidus aute, sumptis tam honeste epulis, uti divino iussu res differtur, domum inlaesus revisit'.

[41] *Legenda Christiani. Vita et passio sancti Wenceslai et sancte Ludmile ave eius*, ed. Jaroslav Ludvíkovský, Prague, 1978, p. 66: 'Cui nec ad punctum acquiescens, rursus locum convivii petens, calice accepto, precaria coram omnibus potans, alta profatur voce: "In nomine beati archangeli Michaelis bibamus hunc calicem, orantes et deprecantes, animas quo nostras introducere dignetur nunc in pacem exultationis perpetue." Cui cum quique fideles respondissent: amen, hausto potu universos deosculans, hospicium repetit et membra delicatissima quieti indulgens ac Deo teste precibus et psalmodiis diu insistens, tandem fessus quievit'.

[42] For more on the problem see Petr Sommer, *Začátký křesťanství v Čechách. Kapitoly z dějin raně středověké duchovní kultury*, Prague, 2001, pp. 35–36; Some general remarks on the question of the cult of St Michael in medieval Bohemia can be found in Hana Pátková, 'Le Culte de saint Michel en Bohême et Pologne au Moyen Âge. Bilan des recherches', in *Culto e santuari di san Michele nell'Europa medievale*, ed. Pierre Bouet, Giorgio Otranto and André Vauchez, Bari, 2007, pp. 57–61. The motif of drinking to a saint and exchanging the kiss of peace in the legends of St Wenceslaus has recently been traced by Tomáš Velímský, *Rituál usmíření a nejstarší svatováclavské legendy*, in: *Rituál smíření. Konflikt a jeho řešení ve středověku*, ed. Martin Nodl and Martin Wihoda, Brno, 2008, pp. 31–41. Contrary to what is suggested by the title, the place which the described ritual occupied in the plot structure of the Life of St Wenceslaus was not bound up with the idea of ending the conflict between the brothers.

[43] *Legendy Wolfenbüttelského rukopisu*, ed. Jana Zachová, Prague, 2010; Pavel Spunar, *Kultura českého středověku*, Prague, 1987, pp. 33–36.

originated in the pre-Christian era and which existed in the early medieval period in the Bohemian lands. However, it is significant that the motif of drinking to St Michael remained unknown to the author of the Old-Slavic legend of St Wenceslaus. It was in *Crescente fide* that it appeared for the first time, and the creation of *Crescente fide* is thought of as connected to Bavarian monks from St Emmeram's monastery in Regensburg.[44] In dealing with the question of an allegedly pagan origin of the rite of drinking a toast to a saint, Otto Gerhard Oexle stressed the fact that the suggestion of a pagan background to the rite was connected with the allegations made use of by Carolingian writers who usually viewed the activities of guild organizations negatively. That is why some restraint is advisable in advancing the interpretation which links the emergence of the rite with the pre-Christian era. Of course, no one can deny the fact that collective feasting was a major factor in fostering the identity and stability of all traditional societies.[45] However, as far as the Bohemian lands are concerned, the problem seems more complicated. The view that we are dealing here with a Christianized pagan holiday — with the Christianization process affecting all aspects of traditional cult behaviour — seems to corroborate the opinion held by scholars who argue for the connection between the date of the celebration of the holiday held in honour of Archangel Michael (29 September) and St Wenceslaus (28 September) and the date of the celebration of the pre-Christian harvest festival. The latter is known for having as its indispensable element an uninhibited consumption of food and alcohol.[46] What really matters here is the fact that neither the authors of the legends of St Wenceslaus nor the Regensburg monks in the eleventh century thought that drinking to a saint deserved — because of its pagan character — condemnation or disapproval. Cosmas, too, wrote about celebrations held in St Wenceslaus's honour that lasted three days, and found no fault with the custom.

---

[44] On the controversy see Schommer, 'Die Heiligenminne', pp. 192–93. For more on the problem of dating and the origin of the legend *Crescente fide* see Třeštík, *Počátky Přemyslovců*, pp. 155–75.

[45] On the controversy surrounding the problem of the origin of the rite, see Zimmermann, 'Minnetrinken', pp. 54–55.

[46] See Zdeněk Fiala, 'Dva kritické příspěvky ke starým dějinám českým', *Sborník historický*, 9, 1962, pp. 36–37 and note 164. The absence of the motif of drinking in St Michael's honour in the Old-Slavic legends is accounted for by the fact that the liturgical calendar of the Byzantine Church set a different date for celebrating his holiday. It did not coincide with the Slavic harvest festival taking place at the end of September. See also Dušan Třeštík, *Mýty kmene Čechů (7.–10. století). Tři studie k 'starým pověstem českým'*, Prague, 2003, pp. 10–13.

The motif of drinking *pro caritate* found in all writings devoted to St Wenceslaus may have exerted some influence upon extra-liturgical forms of veneration offered to a patron saint during the celebrations of his day in Prague in September. This holiday provided the duke, as well as the lay and ecclesiastical lords, with an opportunity to gather together in the capital where the ruler would hold a feast. In giving an account of the inauguration of Břetislaus II's reign, Cosmas also made a reference to nobles attending a three-day long celebration organized by the new ruler. It was during these festivities that Břetislaus issued a statute prohibiting people from cultivating pagan traditions.[47] Even more noteworthy is the event recorded under the year 1110. The chronicler writes about Duke Vladislaus and Bohemian lords participating in a feast given in celebration of St Wenceslaus's holiday. During the feast, says the chronicler, there arrives a messenger to break the news that the duke's brother Soběslaus, allied with the Polish ruler, has just entered Bohemian territory, ravaging the country and carrying its people away into captivity. The *mir* necessary to celebrate the holiday in a proper way had thus been definitely shattered.[48] People 'celebrating in a joyful [...] and peaceful atmosphere'[49] had been forced to interrupt their feast and to ready themselves for a campaign against the enemy. 'Shut up your pantries and give up your feasting' pleaded Cosmas's messenger,[50] thus indicating the carnivalesque character of the interrupted celebrations, clearly bound up with the motif of the plenitude of food and drink.

The collective experience of feasting, and especially the role it played in cementing and consolidating traditional communities, has already been investigated by a number of scholars. There is, therefore, no need to go into greater detail here.[51] The September celebrations held in St Wenceslaus's honour, as described above, were certainly designed to serve the same purpose. The whole political community of

[47] *Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Boemorum*, book III/1, pp. 160–61.

[48] For more on the concept of earthly peace in the ideology of ducal and royal power in the twelfth-century Bohemia see Dušan Třeštík, 'Mír a dobrý rok. Státní ideologie raného přemyslovského státu mezi křesťanstvím a "pohanstvím"', *Folia Historica Bohemica*, 12, 1988, pp. 23–41, in this paper the author abandoned most of his former scepticism concerning the functioning of the concept of *mir* in the early Middle Ages in the whole political *oikumene* of the Bohemian people.

[49] 'cum iocunditate et leticia, [...] in tranquillitate et securitate'.

[50] 'Iam claudite vestra promptuaria, linquite convivia', *Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Boemorum*, book III/35, p. 206.

[51] See Althoff, 'Der frieden-', pp. 13–25; idem, 'Fest und Bündnis', in *Feste und Feiern im Mittelalter*, pp. 29–38; Jacek Banaszkiewicz, 'Trzy razy uczta', in *Społeczeństwo Polski średniowiecznej. Zbiór studiów*, Warsaw, 1981–, vol. 5, ed. Stefan K. Kuczyński, 1992, pp. 95–108.

the Bohemian people, led by their duke and by their bishop, gathered cyclically at the grave of St Wenceslaus, a duke and a martyr, in order to reaffirm their allegiance to the saint and show their commitment to peace. It is probably this idea of earthly peace — established within the *comunitas terre* and perpetuated during joyful celebrations — to which Dalimil, the fourteenth-century chronicler, alluded, reminiscing with nostalgia the good old days: 'Lords once came here in September and spent a joyful time together. They also held a council, making peace with the land'.[52] Of course, Czech chroniclers were familiar with the symbolic meaning of collective meals.[53] None of the narrative sources, however, tried to elucidate a ritual aspect of these celebrations, namely the raising of a toast in St Wenceslaus's honour, coupled with the exchanging of the kiss of peace. The reinterpretation of the coin images allows us to add one significant detail to our knowledge of Bohemian political culture in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, namely a quasi-liturgical rite which — probably in keeping with Europe-wide practice — crowned an annual feast held in Prague Castle and attended by Bohemia's ruler and lords, which cemented the Czech political community to be ruled for ever by St Wenceslaus.

---

[52] 'dřieve páni na řiji se sjezdiechu / a v hromadě v utěšení přěbudiechu / a tu za obyčej v radě sediechu / a pokoj veliký zemi činiechu', *Staročeská kronika tak řečeného Dalimila: Vydání textu a veškerého textového materiálu*, 3 vols, Prague 1988–95, vol. 2, ed. Jiří Daňhelka et al., 1988, chapter 75, paragraph 35–38, p. 284. The fact that St Wenceslaus's holiday lost much of its religious significance in the late Middle Ages is attested to by remarks made by a chronicler of the Prague Church, Beneš Krabice, pertaining to the year 1370: 'Eodem anno ad festivitatem sancti Wenceslai paucissimi convenerant homines; karitas enim et devocio refriguerant, et homines dati deliciis Deum et sanctos eius, ut sic dicam, minus venerabantur. Unde permissione divina maxima pestilencia fuit in omnibus partibus et finibus Boemie', *Chronicon Benesii de Weitmil*, ed. Josef Emler, in *Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum*, vol. 4, 1884, p. 542.

[53] That it was the function exercised by the feast is seen in Cosmas's known account concerning the political fall of Komes Bilina Mstiš (see *Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Boemorum*, book II/19, p. 111), recorded under the year 1061. Duke Vratislaus II, who arrived in the Castle invited by Mstiš with a view to participating in the consecration of the church founded by the latter, refused, unlike the bishop, to share a table with Mstiš and decided to dine in the garden. The lord could hold out no hope for the duke's favour over whose wife he had once been supposed to keep watch during her captivity and whom he had then failed to show the respect she deserved. In Cosmas's narrative this refusal to dine with the Nobleman prepared the ground for future developments; for it was still during the feast that Mstiš had been informed of the duke's plan to divest him of the administration of the Bilina estate. The lord had to escape in order to avoid torture. The motif of separate feasting — the duke in the garden and the Komes in his manor — needs to be seen here through the prism of the role it plays in the narrative structure, and cannot be seriously treated as a source of information about the nature of ducal and private property in the eleventh century.

2. Princeps fundator — princeps praedator

Devotional images commonly appeared on coins manufactured in Central Europe in the eleventh century. A scene which represents the incumbent ruler requesting a patron saint for protection is certainly among the most numerous examples. It is to be found in Boleslaus the Wrymouth's widely known brakteate (a thin coin which had an image on one side only) with an image of St Adalbert. It can also be seen on a number of coins minted in the name of many of Boleslaus's successors. Attempts have been made to link the issue of the first coin with the political event of the period. At first, the coin image was interpreted as representing the ruler's public penance for blinding his brother in 1113, with the pilgrimage to the saint's grave in Gniezno being the high point of the ruler's attempt to expiate his sins. Then — after dismissing this theory on the grounds that the coin had probably not been struck in 1113 — it came to be regarded as connected to the efforts to defend Gniezno's metropolitan status against the claims made by Norbert, the archbishop of Magdeburg, in the early 1130s.[54] However, a coin depicting a saint giving his blessing to a ruler carries a universal meaning and thus cannot be regarded as saying anything about the political circumstances in which it was minted.

Coin images with a ruler cast in the role of a church founder are only rarely found in coin iconography, even though the motif was extensively used in visual arts of the Middle Ages. For this reason, three Bohemian deniers from the first half of the twelfth century — the issue of which is connected to the names of three dukes, Svatopluk, Vladislaus I and Soběslaus I, that is, to one generation of the Přemyslid rulers, grandsons of Břetislaus I — constitute an interesting exception. The coin issued in the name of Svatopluk of Moravia and dated to the period of his rule in Prague (1107–09), which was interpreted above, (il. I) is the oldest of these examples.[55] On the obverse of the coin there is a half-figure image of a ruler turned to the right and holding in his hands a model of a towered temple with a cross on top. The identity of the founder is revealed by the legend which gives the name of the duke: SVATOPVLC. The reverse side of Vladislaus I's denier represents a very similar icono-

[54] Ryszard Kiersnowski, 'O brakteatach z czasów Bolesława Krzywoustego i roli kultu św. Wojciecha w Polsce', in *Święty Wojciech w polskiej tradycji historiograficznej. Antologia tekstów*, ed. Gerard Labuda, Warsaw, 1997, pp. 321–22 (first printed in *Wiadomości Numizmatyczne*, 3, 1959), also Stanisław Suchodolski, 'Kult svatého Václava a svatého Vojtěcha prizmatem raně středověkých polských mincí', *Numismatický sborník*, 20, 2005, pp. 29–41.

[55] Cach, no. 460.

graphic type. The similarities to be found in the figure of the founder are strong enough to suggest that its dies may have been based on those used for striking the coins of Svatopluk (il. IV).[56] The third of the artifacts dealt with here — the denier of Soběslaus I — has different characteristics. It shows a full-figure image of a seated ruler with his legs crossed and a model of a two-towered church in his hands (il. V). The image of the duke is accompanied by the legend: +DVX SOBE(slaus).[57]

The ideological message which these images are supposed to convey has no need of explication here. Church foundations constitute one of the most important elements of the representation of royal power in the Middle Ages. Founding churches was an act targeted at celestial powers with a view to securing salvation in Heaven, but also with a view to obtaining assistance in the exercise of power on earth. It was also aimed at the subjects who were to be convinced that their ruler enjoyed divine favour by the erection of new churches.[58] Coins, however, were very rarely relied on for the dissemination of such ideas. It is only a German denier, struck by the Speyer mint and dated to the 1180s, that can be considered analogous to the Bohemian artifacts under discussion. The denier contains an image of a ruler identified as Henry IV. The ruler is holding a model of a two-towered temple. The model represents Speyer Cathedral, which was the Salian dynasty's most important church foundation.[59] The use of this motif on the coin from the reign of Frederick Barbarossa can be explained by the significant role which Speyer Cathedral continued to play in the ideology of imperial power. Later, in the time of the Staufen dynasty, the cathedral remained as the burial site for German emperors. Harking back to the Salian tradition was probably motivated by a desire to enhance the legitimacy of imperial power and it may have been commemorative reasons that determined the choice of iconography.[60] In relation to the Bohemian

[56] Cach, no. 557.

[57] Cach, no. 573.

[58] See especially Roman Michałowski, *Princeps fundator. Studium z dziejów kultury politycznej w Polsce piastowskiej X–XIII wieku*, Warsaw, 1993; on the iconographic analysis of foundation images from late antiquity to the late Middle Ages see Emanuel S. Klinkenberg, *Compressed Meanings. The Donor's Model in Medieval Art to around 1300: Origin, Spread and Significance of an Architectural Image in the Realm of Tension between Tradition and Likeness*, Turnhout, 2009, *Architectura Medii Aevi*, vol. 2.

[59] Percy Ernst Schramm, *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige in Bildern ihrer Zeit 751–1190*, Munich, 1983, p. 243, no. 80, tab. no. 171/80; also Klinkenberg, *Compressed Meanings*, pp. 150–52.

[60] Caspar Ehlers, *Metropolis Germaniae. Studien zur Bedeutung Speyers für das Königtum (751–1250)*, Göttingen, 1996, pp. 172–83; Odilo Engels, 'Der Dom zu Speyer im Spiegel des salischen und staufischen Selbstverständnisses', *Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte*, 32, 1980, pp. 27–40.

lands, the oldest foundation scene is to be found in the St Catherine Rotunda in Znojmo which is from the same period as the coins that concern us. The church's arcade opens out its apse onto a nave and is flanked by images of the founders — Conrad II with a temple model in his hands, and his wife holding a goblet. The goblet is a gift. An image of Christ fills the concha of the apse, and it is probably Christ himself who is going to be the recipient of the gifts brought by the ducal couple.[61] The same iconographic convention appeared about a century later on a tympanum — dated around the year of 1240 — of the Cistercian convent of Porta Coeli in Tišnov. The tympanum represents the founder of the convent, Queen Constance of Hungary, and her late husband King Přemysl Otakar I, in a gesture of laying a church model at the feet of the enthroned Christ.[62] The Bohemian coin images dealt with here differ from their chronologically and geographically closest iconographic parallels — that is, from the Polish tympana bound up with the activity of Palatine Piotr Włostowic and his family, and from other Western European artifacts of this type — in one important detail, namely in lacking a patron saint to whom a temple model is to be given.[63] It must have stemmed, at least in part, from technical and compositional reasons: the figure of the ruler-founder was contrasted with an enlarged figure of a saint. Such a difference in size between the two figures followed the existing tradition; indeed the ruler was likely to be dwarfed by the saint to the point where his figure became hard to see clearly. What may have been involved here was an attempt to universalize the message. A figure holding a model of a temple may have been used as a symbol of the munificence that the ruler was prepared to show not only towards a particular institution and its patron saint but towards the whole Church. However, this does not change the essence of the ideological message that the image was supposed to disseminate, or the way in which it was expected to affect its users. Is it then possible that the use of a conventional image of the ruler-founder was connected with the act of a specific church foundation?[64] It is hard to give a definitive answer to this question. There is strong evidence to suggest such a connec-

[61] Anežka Merhautová, 'Znojemská rotunda a její nástěnné malby', in Barbara Krzemieńska, Anežka Merhautová and Dušan Třeštík, *Moravští Přemyslovci ve znojemské rotundě*, Prague, 2000, pp. 62–63.

[62] Jiří Kuthan, *Česká architektura v době posledních Přemyslovců. Města — hrady — kláštery — kostely*, Vimperk, 1994, pp. 404–06.

[63] Krystyna Mączewska-Pilch, *Tympanon fundacyjny z Ołbina na tle przedstawień o charakterze donacyjnym*, Wrocław, 1973; Przemysław Mrozowski, 'Fundator i jego postawa w ikonografii zachodniej IX–XII wieku', *Sprawozdania PTPN. Wydział Nauk o Sztuce*, 105, 1989, pp. 20–26.

[64] Witold Garbaczewski has recently leaned towards resolving this dilemma in

tion with regards to Vladislaus I and Soběslaus, as their foundation activities left traces in both diplomatic and narrative sources. It is different, however, with the pioneer of this type of deniers — Svatopluk.

Svatopluk's deniers are distinguished by iconographic programmes which remain absent from previous Bohemian coinage. In addition to the foundation scene mentioned above, five types of coins minted in the name of Svatopluk include an image of a ruler kneeling in front of the altar in a praying pose.[65] The frequent use of devotional elements in coin iconography during the short period of Svatopluk's rule in Prague is significant and probably not accidental. Nevertheless, in contrast to his numerous predecessors, Svatopluk did not become famous for founding any church. Attempts to link him with the foundation of a Benedictine monastery in Postoloprty are nothing but a supposition for which there is no clear evidence. A historiographic portrait of Svatopluk painted by Cosmas suggests that he behaved in the opposite manner. When imprisoned by King Henry V, he strove to have himself released from captivity by promising to pay so large an amount of money to King Henry that he was left with no option but to steal from Bohemian subjects and churches — including the Prague Cathedral — whatever treasures they had. As Cosmas writes: 'Certainly, no abbot, provost, or clergyman had managed to avoid making some of his coffers' contents over to the duke';[66] the bishop of Prague, Herman, was forced to provide the duke with as much as 70 pounds of gold and 500 pounds of silver. To make the payment, Herman mortgaged all church chattels to secure a loan from the Jews of Regensburg.[67] It needs to be remembered, of course, that the Prague chronicler cast Svatopluk as the main villain of his work, 'endowing' him with a violent and tyrannical personality. However, Cosmas — who served already as member of the chapter and was thus an eyewitness to the events he wrote about — gave such a detailed account of the events that there is little doubt about the reliability of his writing.

The way in which the duke treated Bohemian churches, taking possession of their valuables, did not deter him from striking coins whose iconography presented him as a pious and church-founding ruler. Was

favour of a symbolic interpretation of these representations. Garbaczewski, 'Topos na monetach', pp. 81–82.

[65] Cach, nos. 461–65; for the analysis of this ruler's coinage from the metrological viewpoint see: Radoměrský, 'Peníze Kosmova věku', pp. 92–95. Ryszard Kiersnowski also stressed an untypical character of the iconographic programme present on Svatopluk's coins (*Moneta w kulturze*, p. 266 — the book devotes a much space to discussing devotional motifs in European coinage).

[66] 'certe non abbas, non prepositus, non clericus [...] fuit, qui non conferret invitus aliquid duci de sua apotheca'.

[67] *Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Boemorum*, book III/21, p. 188.

the duke's resort to an innovative iconographic programme, to be carried out by coins issued in his name, an attempt to expunge from his subjects' memory the abuse of church property during the early part of his reign? It is not possible to answer the question unequivocally, but such an interpretation seems entirely plausible.

The same motifs found in deniers of Svatopluk's successors can rightly be interpreted as connected to actual and well-known foundation activities. Maintaining close relations with the Benedictine monastery situated at Zwiefalten in Svabia, Duke Vladislaus I and his wife Salomea of Berg set up in Kladruby (Western Bohemia) the Benedictine convent whose members were to observe the Cluniac version of the Benedictine rule.[68] The couple had transferred the convent from Zwiefalten, and that the Kladruby convent came to enjoy great prestige is attested to by the fact that it was the ducal couple's preferred final resting place.[69] The burial of Vladislaus I thus became an unprecedented event. It was the first burial of a Bohemian duke to take place outside Prague, the traditional centre of Přemyslid power. In this context all the attempts aimed at spreading the image of a pious ruler known for his generosity towards the church appear to be easy to understand.

It also seems that in the case of Soběslaus I, an ideological message disseminated through coin iconography was connected to actual events. One may presume that there was a connection between the issue of Soběslaus's deniers and a magnificent donation he made at the turn of 1229 and 1230 to his father's foundation, the Basilica of St Peter and St Paul. As a matter of fact, Soběslaus's effort amounted here to a re-founding of the collegiate church which had decayed, as indicated in the duke's document, through the negligence of other dukes and provosts. This is how the ruler's actions were understood by an anonymous continuator of

[68] On the contacts between the Přemyslids and a familial abbey of the House of Berg see Kateřina Horníčková, 'Pražský biskup Meinhard a umělecký patronát ve 12. století', in *Čechy jsou plné kostelů — Bohemia plena est ecclesiis. Kniha k poctě PhDr. Anežky Merhautové, DrSc.*, ed. Milada Studničková, Prague, 2010, pp. 245–49, however, the paper does not take into account remarks crucial for the understanding of the problem made by Szymon Wieczorek in 'Zwiefalten i Polska w pierwszej połowie XII wieku', *KH*, 103, 1996, 4, pp. 23–54.

[69] *Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Boemorum*, book III/58, p. 236; it is worth stressing that Cosmas generally made no mention of monastic foundations by Bohemian dukes. Chattels which the monastery possessed at the moment of the foundation are mentioned in a forged document drafted in the name of Duke Vladislaus during the latter half of the thirteenth century, but the forger certainly drew material from twelfth-century sources, see *Codex diplomaticus et epistolaris Regni Bohemiae*, Prague, 1904–, vol. 1, ed. Gustav Friedrich, 1904–07, no. 111 (hereafter CDB).

Cosmas's chronicle who wrote almost contemporaneously with the events discussed here. The church acquired then a new porch, decorative floor, and a roof covering. It was adorned with polychromies and fitted out with precious chattels — there was a *corona* type chandelier hanging down from the ceiling, and there were new crosses, altar covers, and liturgical manuscripts.[70] The chronicler's account is clearly in tune with Soběslaus I's document dated to 1130. The duke, just as his father had done, used the untypical title of 'monarch of all the Bohemians by the grace of God' (*dei gratia Boemorum monarcha*), doubled the dean's stipend, founded three additional prebends for canons, and ordered the compilation of an inventory of the church's chattels. The purpose of the donation was to increase the number of those who were willing to pray for the duke's salvation. The financial resources needed to celebrate the memorial of the recently deceased Queen Svatava — the mother of the duke and of his two brothers, Boleslaus and Břetislaus II, who were buried in the church — were also increased. The document mentioned above was issued in 1130. It includes a number of statements which indicate the multiple layers of the ideological message involved in the Vyšehrad foundation of Soběslaus I. Moreover, the use of the ducal seal for authenticating the document provided a further opportunity to manifest the ruler's piety and to show the scale of his generosity towards the church, for the sealing of the document took place in front of the main altar of the collegiate church, just next to the relics of its patron saints, the apostles Peter and Paul, and in company of both bishops — the bishop of Prague and the bishop of Olomouc. The title Soběslaus used to mark the date of the issue of the document was also symbolic. He introduced himself as *monarcha Boemorum christianissimus dux*, the son of King Vratislaus II and the nineteenth in the line of Christian rulers of Bohemia. The document expressed the opinion that the poor condition of

[70] A detailed listing of donated chattels and the information concerning the renovation work can be found in *Canonici Wissegradensis continuatio Cosmae*, ed. Josef Emler, in *Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum*, vol. 2, 1874, p. 207, under the year 1129: 'Sobieslaus, ut diximus, renovavit, et renovatam in melius auxit, quia parietes depingi fecit, coronam auream in ea suspendit, quae ponderat XII marcas auri, argenti vero LXXX, aes et ferrum sine numero, pavimentum pollitis lapidibus exornavit, porticus in circuitu addidit, laquearia in lateribus duobus affixit, tegulis summitatem totam cum tectis cooperuit, claustrum et omnes officinas cooperiri iussit; insuper et canonicos eiusdem ecclesiae multiplicavit, stipendiis, praediis, aliisque bonis augmentavit'. On the meaning of *corona* type candleholder and the extent to which Vyšehrad drew its inspiration from Hildesheim see Vladimír Denkstein, 'Někdejší vyšehradský lustr z r. 1129. První středověký korunovační lustr zvaný "koruna"', in *Královský Vyšehrad. Sborník příspěvků*, pp. 83–91.

Vratislaus II's foundation was due to the negligence shown by Soběslaus's predecessors, including his brothers and church administrators. An intention, kept by the duke '*in secreto cordis*', to renew and grace the church founded by his father — which was also the final resting place of his parents and of his two brothers — and the subsequent fulfillment of it served clearly as proof that it was Soběslaus I who deserved to be recognized as the most worthy successor of Vratislaus I. The special status of the collegiate church clearly seen in its independence from the authority of the bishop of Prague, in its operation under the direct authority of the pope, in the exercise of liturgical services by its clergymen in a way similar to that of the Council of Cardinals, and in its performance of the function *capellae specialis* of the ducal court requires no further discussion, although it is certainly worth mentioning here.[71]

Considering what has already been said, there is no doubt that the religious foundation was intended to enhance the legitimization of ducal power. The politico-ideological message of the foundation made itself seen in the face of the lords' conspiracy directed against the duke, for it was revealed soon after the renovation of the church, and the conspirators were to be tried by an assembly which the ruler decided to hold in Vyšehrad.[72] The whole matter also seems to have had something to do with the rivalry between the duke and the bishop of Prague, Meinhard, who owed his elevation to the rank of bishop to Soběslaus's predecessor and who remained in opposition to the incumbent ruler. The hierarch responded to the restoration of the glory of the institution competing with his cathedral by embellishing St Adalbert's grave with precious metals and crystals.[73] This rivalry would soon become much more dramatic.

3. The duke, the bishop, and St Wenceslaus's peace

The third coin to be examined here in terms of connections between its iconographic programme and the contemporary political events is a denier whose three copies were found separately during the excava-

[71] It is a little known, but significant fact that it was not the bishopric, but the Vyšehrad church and, to a lesser degree, other ducal foundations from the eleventh century that received the tithe which the ruler paid to the Church. This was probably one more way in which these institutions were strictly connected to the ducal court. For more on the problem of the extra-material meaning of tithe see: Marcin Rafał Pauk, 'Plenariae decimationes świętego Wojciecha. O ideowych funkcjach dziesięciny monarszej w Polsce i na Węgrzech w XI–XII wieku', in *Gnieźnieńskie koronacje królewskie i ich środkowoeuropejskie konteksty*, ed. Józef Dobosz, Gniezno, 2011, pp. 187–212.

[72] More information on these events follows below.

[73] *Canonici Wissegradensis continuatio*, p. 207.

tion works carried out in Prague Castle in the second half of the twentieth century (il. VI).[74] The question concerns three numismatic artifacts produced using three different dies. Contrary to the reservations that were once held about the origin of the denier, it has been convincingly identified as being minted in the name of Soběslaus I. The coin shows an enthroned figure in an *en face* position, situated in the centre of its obverse side and wielding a spear with a pennant in his left hand. The right hand is raised in a blessing-like gesture over a much smaller person found on the right side of the coin. The latter person, bareheaded and clad in a short tunic, is making a gesture that can be interpreted as a gesture of prayer, as he is reaching his hands forward towards the seated person. The scene is analogous to that found in Soběslaus's other coin that we encountered above in which a tribute-paying orant is kneeling on one knee.[75] According to Polanský it is the scene of a tribute paid by the lords and the common people to a new ruler, that is — Soběslaus I, right after his acclamation.[76] Since Prague Castle was the only archeological site where the coins in question were excavated, it was concluded that the deniers, quite in accordance with Cosmas's account, must have been thrown to the people gathered at the ceremony of the new ruler's enthronement. This interpretation, however, which links the coin with the events of 1125, is not the only possible explanation that can be offered here.

In terms of any ideological message attached to the coin, it is the reverse side of it that appears to be more intriguing. It shows two figures kneeling in a praying pose in front of a vertical object located in the centre which has a triangular top crowned with a finial or stylized cross. On the bottom part of the coin there are some folds to be seen, resembling a draped fabric. The fabric covers the plinth on which the vertical object rests. With a mitre on his head, dressed in pontifical robes, and a crosier in his left hand, the praying figure on the right can easily be identified as a bishop. The figure on the left side of the object with a cross is, just like the orant paying tribute on the obverse side of the coin, dressed in a shorter tunic.

Establishing the identity of the vertical object on which both kneeling figures are concentrating is of crucial importance for the correct interpretation of the whole image. Scholarly literature offers various interpretations of the object, seeing it as a tower or a sacral building

[74] Cach, no. 571.

[75] Cach, no. 570 — the obverse contains the above discussed scene of the duke drinking to St Wenceslaus.

[76] Polanský, 'Nálezy mincí', pp. 225–26.

which symbolizes Heavenly Jerusalem.[77] It is also regarded as representing an altar. There has been little or no disagreement among scholars about the identification of both figures. They are considered to represent patron saints, St Wenceslaus and St Adalbert, whose appearance on Bohemian deniers dates back to the beginning of the twelfth century.[78] Polanský has recently analysed the denier's iconographic programme and endorses the view, once subscribed to more widely by scholars, that the coin shows both saints engrossed in intercessory prayer before the altar. Nevertheless, it is difficult to share his opinion that the object represents an altar slab. The object's vertical and elongated shape is clearly out of keeping with an altar. Altars in the form of a flat mensa with orants kneeling in front of it and a chalice standing on it appear on several types of deniers minted in the name of Svatopluk. It is, therefore, clear that the object bears no resemblance to an altar.[79] In my opinion the object is an example of a reliquary chest, which were so popular in Western Europe in the twelfth century. Among the twelfth-century artifacts one needs to mention those found in Cologne and the Rhine area: the Three Magi reliquary (Cathedral 1181) (il. VII.1), St Maurinus reliquary (St Pantaleon about 1170) and St Albinus reliquary from Cologne (St Pantaleon about 1183/86), St Heribert reliquary from Deutz (1160/70), St Anno reliquary from Siegburg (1181/83) (il. VII.2) known only from the engraving of St Remaclus of Stavelot or St Charles the Great of Aachen (the end of the twelfth century).[80]

The identification of the object as a reliquary makes it possible to offer a convincing interpretation of the two figures kneeling beside it. Their hands, held out in an oath-gesture, are almost touching the chest (this pertains especially to the lay person on the left). We are dealing here with an act of swearing an oath on the relics of a saint. It is the act of *sacramentum*. Such an oath played a significant role in the political culture of the Middle Ages and the fact that depictions of this ceremony were included in Bohemian sources of the twelfth century clearly shows its significance. The scene described here has its closest parallel in the part of the Bayeux Tapestry which represents Harold taking an oath of allegiance to William the Conqueror (il. VIII). The Anglo-Saxon earl is

[77] Merhautová and Třeštík, *Ideové proudy*, pp. 73–74.

[78] Pavel Radoměrský and Václav Ryneš, 'Společná učta sv. Václava a Vojtěcha zvláště na českých mincích a její historický význam', *Numismatické listy*, 13, 1958, pp. 35–48.

[79] See above, note 64.

[80] Kinga Szczepkowska-Naliwajek, *Relikwiarze średniowiecznej Europy od IV do początku XVI wieku. Geneza, treści, styl i techniki wykonania*, Warsaw, 1996, pp. 133–46; Anton Legner, Albert and Irmgard Hirmer, *Romanische Kunst in Deutschland*, Munich, 1999, pp. 88–104.

shown standing between two reliquary chests, each of which lies on a plinth or, rather, a sedan chair draped in fabric. Harold is holding out both hands, laying his palms on the reliquaries.[81] The only difference between those reliquaries and that which can be found on Soběslaus I's coin is that the latter has its top panel turned towards the viewer, which makes its triangular flower or cross finial, so typical of reliquary chests of the twelfth century, clearly visible.

The problem of the role of oath-taking ceremonies in the legal or political culture of medieval Bohemia has attracted the interest of many scholars. Such ceremonies were usually held in the highest echelons of power to sanction important decisions which affected the whole political community: the acclamation of a new ruler, the settlement of the problem of succession, the arrangement of alliances, the conclusion of peace treaties, and the like.[82] Keeping pledges made on various occasions was to be ensured by sacred powers whose authority was invoked in the very act of swearing an oath. The violation of the oath was certain to result in the exaction of vengeance by an offended deity. The price to be paid for violating an oath is made particularly clear in the texts of Russo-Byzantine treaties inserted in Nestor's chronicle (also known as *the Tale of Bygone Years*) which invoke the authority of pagan deities, Weles and Perun.[83] The use of St Wenceslaus's relics with the aim of reinforcing an oath is attested to relatively late. The Zbraslav chronicle tells the story of a dying King Wenceslaus II who demanded a reliquary with a skull of a saint and told his son to swear an oath on the saint's relic. The oath the son was required to take bound him to settle all the debts incurred during his father's reign while the

[81] Wolfgang Grape, *The Bayeux Tapestry. Monument of a Norman Triumph*, Munich and New York, 1994, p. 117; William Richard Lethaby, 'Perjury in Bayeux', in *The Study of the Bayeux Tapestry*, ed. Richard Gameson, Woodbridge, 1997, pp. 19–20.

[82] Josef Žemlička, 'Sacramenta v politickém životě přemyslovských Čech', in *Ve znamení zemí Koruny české. Sborník k šedesátým narozeninám Prof. PhDr. Lenky Bobkové, CSc.*, ed. Luděk Březina, Jana Konvičná and Jan Zdichynec, Prague, 2006, pp. 17–25; see also in the context inter-ethnic relations Nora Berend, 'Oath-taking in Hungary. A Window on Medieval Social Interaction', in: *Central and Eastern Europe in the Middle Ages: A Cultural History. Essays in Honour of Paul W. Knoll*, ed. Piotr Górecki and Nancy van Deusen, London, 2009, pp. 42–49; on the role of oaths and their language in political culture of Carolingian epoch see also: Matthias Becher, *Eid und Herrschaft. Untersuchungen zum Herrscherethos Karls des Grossen*, Sigmaringen, 1993, *Vorträge und Forschungen*, Sonderband 39, pp. 94–110; Patrick J. Geary, 'Oathtaking and Conflict Management in the Ninth Century', in *Rechtsverständnis und Konfliktbewältigung. Gerichtliche und außergerichtliche Strategien im Mittelalter*, ed. Stefan Esders, Cologne, Weimar and Vienna, 2007, pp. 239–53.

[83] For more on the problem see Karol Modzelewski, *Barbarzyńska Europa*, Warsaw, 2004, pp. 154–58.

lords, in whose company he met with his father, were themselves pledged to make sure that the dying man's last wish would fulfilled.[84] One may presume that the reliquaries of patron saints of the land, St Wenceslaus and St Adalbert, had already before been used during public confirmation of various ducal decrees and public agreements.[85]

The role of St Adalbert in the enactment of new laws by the ruler is best illustrated by the proclamation of the so-called statutes of Břetislaus I, as mentioned by Cosmas. According to the chronicler, the act took place in Gniezno during the ruler's campaign against Poland. Břetislaus I's decrees, sanctioned by the spiritual authority of the Prague bishop, Sewer, were devised to spread the norms of Christian morality among the Bohemian people, to eradicate remnants of paganism, and to combat sin with all means available. The political community represented by the lay and ecclesiastical lords of Bohemia, gathered at the grave of St Adalbert confirmed the decrees with an oath sworn on the martyr's relics.[86] Cosmas's vivid account of the event leaves us in no doubt that St Adalbert was supposed to use his supernatural powers to ensure the fulfillment of the obligation incurred at his grave. The saint's consent to open his tomb and transfer his relics to Prague was a sign of the favour and benevolence which he was prepared to show the Bohemian people for repenting their sins and promising to mend their ways.[87]

In Cosmas's ideology, which can be regarded as reflecting views held by members of the Bohemian elite at the beginning of the twelfth century, St Wenceslaus and St Adalbert performed the role of custodians of Bohemia's internal order and of peace (*mir*). The idea found its fullest expression in an account of the intervention of both patron saints in the conflict between King Vratislaus II and his oldest son Břetislaus in 1091. Imprisoned by the ruler, supporters of the prince were set free after St Wenceslaus and St Adalbert broke down the prison's gates with

[84] *Chronicon Aulae Regiae*, ed. Josef Emler, in *Fontes Rerum Bohemicarum*, vol. 4, book I/74, p. 94.

[85] For more on the custom of swearing an oath on the relics of a saint in medieval Poland see Maria Starnawska, *Świętych życie po życiu. Relikwie w kulturze religijnej na ziemiach polskich w średniowieczu*, Warsaw, 2008, pp. 405–14. The information about the papal legate, Gvido, lifting the excommunication imposed on Moravian dukes for their involvement in a coup against the bishop Henry Zdik is chronologically close to the times dealt with here. Under the legate's pressure the dukes swore to make up for the evil they had done 'sacrosanctis ewangeliis, sanctorum reliquiis tactis perfecerunt' — CDB, vol. 1, no. 135.

[86] *Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Boemorum*, book II/4, pp. 84–88.

[87] See the generally felicitous remarks by Petr Kopal, 'Smíření Čechů se svatým Vojtěchem. Struktura jednoho obrazu v Kosmově kronice', in *Rituál smíření*, pp. 45–55.

their own hands and unchained the prisoners. Then, both saints told the freed prisoners to publicize the fact that *mir* had been brought by the saints to the Bohemian people: 'Now that you are assured of God's grace, you should hurry to the church and proclaim that we, that is, St Wenceslaus and St Adalbert had liberated you and brought you *mir*'.[88] At the same time, Conrad, a Moravian duke and the King's brother, mediated in a peace between father and son. The function of a peace-giver exercised by St Wenceslaus was strictly related to the grand assemblies held in Prague each year on 28 September, often coupled — just as at the outset of the reign of Břetislaus II — with the enactment of new laws by the ruler.[89]

In the Hungarian hagiography of Cosmas's era the cult of St Stephen as a patron of earthly peace manifested itself in a similar way. The ceremonies which King Vladislaus I was preparing in 1083 for the canonization of the saint-king simply could not be celebrated because of the conflict which tormented the Arpád dynasty and the continuous imprisonment of the King Salomon. The saint was supposed to show his anger by refusing to agree to the opening of his tomb and elevating of his relics.

It was only after lay and ecclesiastical lords, including the king, had fasted for three days and after Salomon had been released from prison that liturgical ceremonies could be performed.[90] The part played by St Adalbert — a patron saint of the Polish political community in the eleventh and twelfth centuries — in preserving internal peace was not given so vivid a treatment in any Polish source, but it was at least indirectly referred to in the chronicle by Gallus Anonymus. The consecration of Gniezno Cathedral in 1097, dedicated to St Adalbert, could be effected only on condition that the duke's rebellious son, Zbigniew, was released from prison. This must have been the attitude taken by the bishops who successfully promoted Zbigniew's reconciliation with his father, Duke Vladislaus Herman. Boleslaus the Wrymouth's public penance for blinding his brother ended with a solemn pilgrimage to the martyr's grave in Gniezno, accompanied by the founding of a new reliquary, in which St Adalbert's remains, as well as huge

[88] 'Quare iam certi de misericordia Dei exurgite, ad ecclesiam properate nosque nominatim sanctum Wencezlaum et sanctum Adalbertum vos absolvisse et pacem apportasse omnibus nunciate', *Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Boemorum*, book II/47, p. 154.

[89] Ibid., book III/1, pp. 160–61.

[90] *Vita s. Stephani regis ab Hartvico episcopo conscripta*, ed. Emma Bartoniek, in *Scriptores rerum Hungaricarum*, ed. Imre Szentpétery, 2 vols, Budapest, 1937–38, vol. 2, chapter 24, p. 434; on the political significance of St Stephen's canonization ceremony in 1083 see Gabor Klaniczay, *Holy Rulers and Blessed Princesses. Dynastic Cults in Medieval Central Europe*, Cambridge 2000, pp. 123–34; idem, 'Rex iustus: The Saintly Institutor of Christian Kingship', *Hungarian Quarterly*, 41, 2000, pp. 14–31.

grants to the clergy, were to be deposited. What is more, it seems — and this is of some importance here — that Boleslaus did not perform his penance for cruelly blinding his brother, but instead did so for having violated the oath which guaranteed his brother's safety. The oath that Boleslaus broke is highly likely to have been sworn on the relics of the bishop of Prague.[91]

The identification of the object located in the middle of the coin as a reliquary, combined with the knowledge of the role of oaths sworn on relics in the political culture of the Middle Ages clearly leads us to the conclusion that the figures on the coin cannot be regarded as representing patron saints of the Czech lands. Instead they are the duke of Prague and the bishop of Prague involved in performing their respective roles in important political and religious events. This opens the way for a historical interpretation of the scenes illustrated on the denier. Both scenes fit the context of the events from the years 1130–31, the actual or alleged conspiracy against Duke Soběslaus I. It is this conspiracy which was then used as a pretext for suppressing the opposition during the hastily arranged trial in Vyšehrad.[92] A brief summary of these well-known events suffices here. According to the so-called Canon of Vyšehrad, an eyewitness to the events, the conspirators were to be led by members of the Vršovcy family.[93] The bishop of Prague,

[91] It is Cosmas who points to a violation of oath as Boleslaus's main offence with regard to his brother (*Cosmae Pragensis Chronica Boemorum*, book III/34, p. 205). Gallus Anonymus passes over the issue in silence. On the last conflict see Zbigniew Dalewski, *Rytuał i polityka. Opowieść Galla Anonima o konflikcie Bolesława Krzywoustego ze Zbigniewem*, Warsaw, 2005.

[92] For an extensive account of the events see: *Canonici Wissegradensis continuatio*, pp. 207–12; see also works focusing on the political aspect of the conflict: Josef Žemlička, 'Vyšehrad 1130: soud, nebo inscenace? (K "nekosmovskému" pojetí českých dějin)', in *Husitství — Renesance — Reformace. Sborník k 60. narozeninám Františka Šmahela*, ed. Jaroslav Pánek et al., 3 vols, Prague, 1994, vol. 1, pp. 47–68, in whose opinion the charge of conspiracy was spurious and put forward with a view to justifying repression against the main rival, the bishop of Prague; Zdenek Dragoun's thesis ('Konflikt knížete Soběslava s biskupem Menhartem a jeho líčení tzv. Kanovníkem Vyšehradským', *Mediaevalia Historica Bohemica*, 4, 1995, pp. 69–78) that the conflict between the bishop and the duke continued until after 1131 is a mixture of arbitrary interpretation of sources and his own speculations. Karel Malý also failed to shed much light on the problem, see: 'K počátkům crimen laese maiestatis v Čechách — vyšehradský proces z roku 1130', in *Královský Vyšehrad. 3. Sborník příspěvků ze semináře 'Vyšehrad a Přemyslovci'*, ed. Bořivoj Nechvátal et al., Kostelní Vydří, 2007, pp. 103–11.

[93] On Cosmas's 'black' picture of the Wroszwcy family portrayed as made up of confirmed enemies of the dynasty, see Petr Kopal, 'Kosmovi ďáblové. Vršovsko-přemyslovský antagonismus ve světle biblických a legendárních citátů, motivů a symbolu', *Mediaevalia Historica Bohemica*, 8, 2001, pp. 7–41; on the family and its political role in the eleventh and twelfth centuries see also idem, 'Neznámý známý rod. Pokus o genealogii Vršovců', *Sborník archivnich prací*, 51, 2001, pp. 3–83.

Meinhard, was one of those who had joined the conspiracy whose goal was to assassinate the ruler and elevate his nephew Břetislaus to the Bohemian throne. However, they were foiled in their attempt to carry out this coup. Soběslaus succeeded in catching all those concerned in the plot against him, except for the bishop who had gone on pilgrimage to Jerusalem shortly before the conspiracy was revealed. Then, the ruler, on his arrival in Prague, entered the castle barefoot and, clad in penitential garments, went to the grave of St Wenceslaus, praying incessantly.

Soběslaus's next move was to order a trial to be held in Vyšehrad of those who were accused of attempting to assassinate him. The trial was one by ordeal. There ensued bloody executions of the conspirators, with the most serious candidate to take Soběslaus's place being blinded. Following here the convincing interpretation offered by Andrzej Pleszczyński, the first thing to be noted is the function of the ritual of public penance done by the Bohemian ruler in front of St Wenceslaus's relics.[94] The performance of the ritual by Soběslaus should be interpreted as being aimed at propitiating the patron saint on behalf of the whole community in connection with the sin committed by the bishop and a group of lords. It should not be understood as a manifestation of gratitude on the part of the duke clearly glad of escaping his assassins. Besides, we may also presume — although there is no explicit evidence for it — that the enthronement rite in the twelfth-century Bohemia involved the swearing of an oath of allegiance to a new ruler on the relics of St Wenceslaus.[95] In the act of taking this oath a throne made of stone was used and the whole ceremony took place not far from the martyr's grave situated in St Vitus's Cathedral.[96] Thus those involved in the conspiracy against the duke were automatically guilty of turning on the patron saint, the guarantor of the most important element of political order, that is, the allegiance which the lords owed to the ruler.

---

[94] Andrzej Pleszczyński, 'Sobiesław I — rex Ninivitarum. Książę czeski w walce z ordynariuszem praskim Meinhardem, biskupem Rzeszy', in *Monarchia w średniowieczu — władza nad ludźmi, władza nad terytorium*, ed. Jerzy Pysiak, Aneta Pieniądz-Skrzypczak and Marcin Rafał Pauk, Warsaw and Kraków, 2002, pp. 125–38.

[95] In 1139 Soběslaus himself decided to use an oath by the relics of a saint as a way of securing his succession order given in favour of his little son Vladislaus; similarly Meinhard was to administer an oath by a saint's relics to those who conspired against Soběslaus ('duos digitos super reliquias sanctorum posuit') — *Canonici Wissegradensis continuatio*, pp. 229, 211.

[96] On the Christianization of the place of election and enthronement of Bohemian rulers because of St Wenceslaus himself and in connection with the erection of a rotunda in which St Vitus's relics were held see Třeštík, *Počátky Přemyslovců*, pp. 408–11.

The canon of Vyšehrad tells us that Meinhard, who was on his pilgrimage to the Holy Land when the crackdown against the rest of the plotters was taking place, upon returning from his trip, turned himself in to the ruler and lords *ad omnia iudicia* in the hope of exonerating himself from the charge of treason.[97] He was supposed to be tried by the 'secular' court, even though two bishops — Adalbert, the archbishop of Mainz, and Otto, the bishop of Bamberg — were to play a significant role in trying him. Not long afterwards, as can be inferred from the account of the chronicler, Meinhard was publicly exonerated of any blame. The examination of his case reached its climax on St Wenceslaus's Day — 28 September 1131: 'The bishops of Bamberg and of Olomouc, assisted by seven Bohemian abbots, in the presence of Duke Soběslaus, the Bohemian people and clergy, took off their stoles, thus clearing Meinhard — the bishop of the holy church of Prague — of all charges that had been laid against him. They stated publicly that he was not involved in scheming against Soběslaus, trying only to find a way of freeing Břetislaus from prison'.[98] Here, too, one needs to subscribe to the view expressed by Pleszczyński who maintained that a stole-removing ritual allowed these two high-ranking clergymen to act as oath-helpers for the bishop of Prague during the trial held in the ducal court, and thus take part in judicial proceedings proper to secular courts.[99] The two bishops and seven abbots did not appear in court in their capacity as clergymen. They served as guarantors of the oath to be taken by the bishop, performing the role usually reserved for relatives of the defendant. As a foreigner, Meinhard probably could not produce a sufficient number of his relatives. The procedure applied was a normal exoneration procedure provided for in customary law which, however, had already in the ninth century found its way into canon law. It provided the accused with an opportunity to prove his case by bringing a sufficient number of men equal to his standing to swear that they believed his oath.[100] The procedure applied in 1131

[97] *Canonici Wissegradensis continuatio*, p. 213.

[98] 'IV Kal. Octobris praesul Bamberiensis et antistes Olomucensis cum septem Bohemiensibus abbatibus, astante duce Sobieslao, cum populo et clero Meynhardum, sanctae Pragensis ecclesiae episcopum, ab omni culpa, quae prius illata sibi fuerat, per depositionem suarum stolarum expurgaverunt, profitendo videlicet Meynhardum episcopum nihil adversi duci Sobieslao cogitasse, nisi ad hoc solummodo elaborasse, quomodo Bracizlaus a vinculis possit liberari'.

[99] Pleszczyński, 'Sobiesław I — rex Ninivitarum', pp. 137–38.

[100] See Stefan Esders, 'Der Reinigungseid mit Helfern. Individuelle und kollektive Rechtsvorstellungen in der Wahrnehmung und Darstellung frühmittelalterlicher Konflikte', in *Rechtsverständnis und Konfliktbewältigung*, pp. 55–77, esp. pp. 70–71; also Gerhard Schmitz, *De presbiteris criminosis. Ein Memorandum Erzbischof Hincmars von Reims über straffällige Kleriker*, Hanover, 2004, *MGH Schriften und Texte*, vol. 34, pp. 13–14.

during the Prague meeting of notables satisfied these requirements. The great number of high-ranking compurgators — there were as many as nine of them — attested to the importance of both the case and the defendant.

Let us return to the iconography of the denier discussed here. First of all, the scene on the coin does not relate to the procedure described above — the bishop is accompanied by only one person who is his equal. The Vyšehrad chronicler, to be sure, did not mention anything about a separate ceremony of reconciliation between the bishop and the ruler, but it must have taken place very soon after Meinhard took an oath that cleansed him of the charge of treason.[101] It is the image stamped on the coin, minted in the name of Soběslaus, that justifies drawing such a conclusion. The reconciliation and restoration of peace between the two current leaders of the Bohemian people — the duke and the bishop of Prague — took place in front of the relics of the patron saint of the whole political community, St Wenceslaus, during a religious holiday celebrated in his honour. The celebration of the holiday, as we have already seen, was designed to renew and sustain a bond between the ruler and the elite of the country.

The small image that appears on the coin was thus intended to convey an important political and ideological message. It can even be considered to have served as a tool used for announcing the restoration of order and stability within the Bohemian community. With the ducal coins in circulation, the promulgation of this fact was made possible. The coin iconography must have been easy to understand for a great number of coin users. After all, it was *omnes Boemi — milites primi et secondi ordinis* who were given an opportunity to see and worship the reliquary containing the remains of the patron saint of the Bohemian people when they arrived in Prague each September to take part — along with the duke, lords, and higher clergy — in the mass meetings talked about here. The image on Soběslaus's coin is, then, an important link which allows us to reconstruct important events from 1130–31. This reconstruction also helps us to better understand, or even bring to light, an important aspect of the political culture of the twelfth century.

It remains to discuss the scene to be found on the obverse side of the coin which is the focus of our interest here and in which Luboš Polanský wanted to see a tribute paid to the ruler in the beginning of

[101] Cf. Žemlička, 'Vyšehrad 1130', p. 60. The relations between the duke and the bishop, as can be inferred from the account of the Canon of Vyšehrad, were no longer hostile but certainly there was not too much trust between the two men.

his reign by one of the lords representing *pars pro toto* the whole political community.[102] This interpretation, when put in the context of the events from the years 1130–31, is not convincing. The enthroned figure holding a spear in his left hand and raising his right hand in a blessing gesture needs to be identified as St Wenceslaus — which is in keeping with the Czech iconographic tradition — while the person paying him tribute is to be identified as Soběslaus I. The scene, then, can be treated as an illustration of the account — included in the chronicle by the Canon of Vyšehrad — of Soběslaus's penitent pilgrimage to the relics of the saint in Prague Cathedral. Such a pilgrimage was made with a view to expressing gratitude for having one's life saved and to offering an apology to the saint for having the country's internal peace disrupted by conspirators who had sacrilegiously attempted to assassinate his earthly vicar. An iconographic motif that had already been made use of on a variety of occasions could now be exploited in close relation to the current political events. In fact, the obverse of the coin demonstrated the ruler's victory and asserted his supremacy in the whole political community, which manifested itself in him liaising between the sacred 'eternal' duke of the Bohemian people and the whole *communitas*. The idea would soon find as clear an expression in legends of ducal and royal seals of Soběslaus's successor, Vladislaus II, where the Bohemian ruler is depicted as the saint's vicar and the custodian of the peace the saint had established.[103] The reverse side of the coin, in turn, was designed to inform subjects of the peaceful relationship between the most important leaders of political community.

In conclusion, it should be said that the analysis of coin images and their uses by rulers presented above justifies the opinion that contemporary political events and considerations influenced the selection of iconographic representations displayed on coins. It also proves that rulers used coins to promote their own positive self image, regardless of whether this

[102] Polanský, 'Nálezy mincí', p. 224.

[103] Duke Vladislaus's seal from the years of 1146/48 showing an image of St Wenceslaus was equipped with the following legend: PAX SCI WACEZLAI IN MANU DUCIS VADISLAVZ (CDB, vol. 1, no. 157); used after the coronation and known from a few imprints from the years 1160–69, two-sided seal with a majestic image of the king and St Wenceslaus has on the latter's side a similar legend, but containing a significant reversal of roles: PAX REGIS WLADISLAI IN MANU SCI WENCES/// (CDB, vol. 1, nos. 210, 247). The meaning of the reversal is not quite clear (cf. Merhautová and Třeštík, *Ideové proudy*, pp. 95–96). One needs to pay attention here to an ambiguity that appears in the interpretation of Bohemian coin images of the twelfth century, since the enthroned figure with a spear can be identified both as St Wenceslaus and as the present ruler of the Přemyslid dynasty, see: Polanský and Mašek, 'Ikonografie', p. 120.

image had anything to do with their actual conduct. In trying to answer the question posed by Stanisław Suchodolski, which asked whether or not coin images reflected or created political reality, one — given the artifacts analysed here — needs to subscribe to the second option. However, it does not change the fact that the selection of a coin's message may have been occasionally determined by present political conditions. But even in the latter case, the ideological message — which is clearly present in the scene of the duke and bishop swearing an oath on the relics of the saint — appeals to universal categories and ideas: the scene just mentioned expresses the restoration of sacred order in the whole political community. The deniers representing a ducal toast also refer to a specific and real event — annual celebrations held in honour of a patron saint. Their goal was not to illustrate a rite with which members of the Bohemian elite, and probably most Bohemian subjects, were well-acquainted. They served the purpose of cementing the image of the ruler as the custodian of the sacred order and as a liaison between the political community and its patron saint.

(Translated by Artur Mękarski)

Summary

The article is composed of three separate parts for which the common denominator is the use of the iconography of Bohemian deniers from the first half of the twelfth century. The images featured on the coins of Duke Svatopluk (1107–09), Vladislaus I (1110–25) and Soběslaus I (1125–40) constitute a point of departure for reflections on the essential components of the political culture of the Early and High Middle Ages.

In contrast to existing Czech literature the author interpreted the scenes presented on the deniers of Svatopluk and Soběslaus I (Cach nos. 460, 570) as an illustration of a ritual toast raised by the duke in honour of St Wenceslaus. It probably constituted a heretofore-unknown element of an annual celebration of the martyrdom of the saint (28 September), which entailed a convention and a three-day feast attended by the ruler and the lay and ecclesiastical lords.

Reflections in the second part focus on the depictions of Svatopluk, Vladislaus I and Soběslaus I (Cach nos. 460, 557, 573) in foundation scenes. The author examines the degree to which the application of a likeness of a ruler holding a model of a church reflected an actual religious foundation or the universal idea of the generosity towards the clergy. In the case of Vladislaus I and Soběslaus I the sources contain information about imposing ducal foundations, but in the case of Svatopulk there is no such correlation while the episode described by Cosmas and concerning the seizure of Church property by the duke for political reasons compels us to assume that the portrait of the ruler-founder on the coin was to obliterate the unfavourable impression produced by his conduct.

The third fragment is a new interpretation of a scene featured on a denier of Soběslaus I, earlier associated with the inauguration of his reign in 1125 (Cach no. 571). In this case, the author noticed a reference to current political events from 1130–31 (chiefly the conflict involving Soběslaus and Meinhard, the bishop of Prague). The scene showing two men praying in front of a centrally located object is interpreted as an act of swearing an oath by both antagonists on the relics of St Wenceslaus, probably after the bishop was cleared of an accusation of treason during the celebrations of the day of St Wenceslaus on 28 September 1131.

(Translated by Aleksandra Rodzińska-Chojnowska)

I.1
Duke Svatopluk's denier (1107–09)
Type: Cach, no. 460
Obverse: + SVATOPVLC
Reverse: + VVENCEZLAVS
Collections: Moravské Zemské Museum in Brno, Inventory No. 16968

I.2

II.
Soběslaus I's denier (1125–40)
Type: Cach, no. 570
Obverse: + DVX SOBESLAV /
Reverse: SCS VVENCESLAVS
Collections: Moravské Zemské Museum in Brno, Inventory No. 205697

III.
Gumpold's Legend
The so-called Codex of Emma (fragm. F.20v)
Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel
Cod. Guelf. 11,2

IV.
Vladislaus I's denier (1100–25)
Type: Cach, no. 557
Obverse: + DVX VLADIZLAVS
Reverse: + SCS VVENCEZLAVS
Collections: Moravské Zemské Museum in Brno, Inventory No. 16989

V.
Soběslaus I's denier (1125–40)
Type: Cach, no. 573
Obverse: + DVX SOBE/////
Reverse: + S/////ZLAVS
Collections: Moravské Zemské Museum in Brno, Inventory No. 208979

VI.
Soběslaus I's denier (1135–40)
Type: Cach, no. 571
Obverse: + /S/B/ESLAV//
Reverse: + /AN//VVENCE/////
Collections: Moravské Zemské Museum in Brno, Inventory No. 17066

VII.1
The Three Kings reliquary
The Cologne Cathedral (after 1167)

VII.2
St Anno reliquary
Nicolaus of Verdun, around 1183
The Siegburg Monastery

VIII.
Bayeux Tapestry, around 1080
The scene of Harold swearing an oath on the relics

Kwartalnik Historyczny
Vol. CXXI, 2014
Special Issue, pp. 49–70
PL ISSN 0023-5903

MICHAŁ TYMOWSKI
Warsaw

WOMEN DURING THE EARLY PORTUGUESE EXPEDITIONS TO WEST AFRICA

The role of women in the early phase of Portuguese expeditions to Africa has only been discussed incidentally in works on geographical discoveries. Avelino Teixeira de Mota briefly addressed the problem when writing about the garrison of São Jorge da Mina fortress. Joseph Bato'ora Ballong-Wen-Mewuda also made a passing reference to women in the discussion of a broad range of other issues.[1] Similar in character are some passages in works by Christopher DeCorse and John Vogt.[2] Paul Hair relegated his perspicacious remarks to the footnotes of his work on the founding of the fortress at Mina (now Elmina).[3] More extensively the issue has been dealt with in some articles discussing the role of African women in the development of domestic trade networks in West Africa and exploring the networks' links with the Portuguese trade.[4] However,

[1] Avelino Teixeira da Mota, *Alguns aspectos da colonisação e do comércio marítimo dos Portugueses na África Ocidental nos séculos XV e XVI*, Lisbon, 1976; idem, *Some Aspects of Portuguese Colonization and Sea Trade in West Africa in the 15th and 16th Centuries*, Bloomington, IN, 1978, p. 10; Joseph Bato'ora Ballong-Wen-Mewuda, *São Jorge da Mina 1482–1637. La vie d'un comptoir portugais en Afrique occidentale*, 2 vols, Lisbon and Paris, 1993, vol. 1, pp. 267–69.

[2] John Vogt, *Portuguese Rule on the Gold Coast 1469–1682*, Athens, 1979, pp. 46–47, 51, 55–56; Christopher R. DeCorse, *An Archaeology of Elmina. Africans and Europeans on the Gold Coast, 1400–1900*, Washington, DC, and London, 2001, pp. 36–37.

[3] Paul Hair, *The Founding of the Castelo de São Jorge da Mina. An Analysis of the Sources*, Madison, WI, 1994, p. 91 n. 195, p. 92 n. 197, p. 95 n. 211.

[4] Philip J. Havik, 'Woman and Trade in the Guinea Bissau Region: the Role of African and Luso-African Women in Trade Networks from the Early 16th to the Mid-19th Century', *Studia*, (Lisbon), 52, 1994, pp. 83–120; idem, 'Comerciantes e concubinas: sócios estratégicos no comércio Atlântico na Costa da Guiné', in *A dimensão atlântica da África*, São Paulo, 1997, pp. 165–68.

these works concern the second half of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, while here we focus on an earlier period. To these we may add a noteworthy chapter in a book by David Northrup, which ranges from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries.[5]

The aim here is to collect and examine all the available source materials in order to shed light on the role played by women in the history of Portuguese contacts with Africa in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. We shall focus our attention on both African and European women involved in the cultural encounters under discussion. The way in which such encounters unfolded, as well as the results they produced, depended not only on the number of participants on each side, but also on their social status, age and sex. Hence, a women's presence, or absence, mattered at each stage of these contacts, beginning with plundering raids and ending with regular and undisturbed trade.

Europeans who embarked on expeditions to Africa constituted a specific group. They were outnumbered by Africans, with whom they fought, negotiated, or traded. These young men carried out their tasks either in a total absence of female companionship or — and this was the case only after the establishment of more regular contacts with Africa — with a very small number of women present. In Africa, the world of European sailors, merchants, conquerors, fortress builders, manufacturers and explorers was almost exclusively male. On the other hand, whole African societies encountered with European newcomers. Africans were not only more numerous, but they also differed from one another in terms of age, sex, and social function.

In the early phase of Portuguese expansion the explorers' attention was drawn to African women, seen at first mainly as slaves to be hunted for, but also as objects of sexual desire, fascination, or fear.

In 1441 a small caravel with a crew of twenty-one people commanded by Antão Gonçalves reached the Saharan coast in the region of Rio de Ouro. Several crew members went ashore in search of 'some man or woman [...] whom they could capture'. First, they came across a young man who, after being wounded, fell into the hands of his pursuers. Then they saw more people on the top of a hill and followed them, but to no avail. As the night drew closer, the Portuguese decided to retreat to their ship. As they were returning, 'they saw a black Mooress come along (who was a slave of those on the hill)'. Some suggested leaving her alone, for they were afraid it might have been an ambush. However, Antão Gonçal-

[5] David Northrup, *Africa's Discovery of Europe 1450–1850*, 2nd edn, Oxford, 2009, pp. 69–75.

ves ordered his men to show no sign of weakness or fear and try to capture her. The people who had earlier been seen on the hill wanted to come to her rescue, but they fled once they saw that the Portuguese were ready to fight.[6]

Zurara again referred to the suspicion that African women might have wanted to lure the Portuguese into a trap in the account of the 1445 expedition, led by Antão Gonçalves and several other caravel commanders.[7] In the area of White Cape the expedition exchanged goods with the inhabitants of the African coast. However, Gonçalves and his men remained wary and distrustful. Some hostages were exchanged on that occasion. The two Portuguese were taken to the Moors' tents, where they saw a number of beautiful women who began to seduce them, some in a very licentious way. According to the chronicler, it was the fear of running into an ambush that made the Portuguese capable of resisting their desire. 'But' — wrote Zurara — 'whether this was attempted with deceit, or whether it was only the wickedness of their nature that urged them to this, let it be the business of each one to settle as he thinks best'.[8]

Africans probably wanted to take advantage of the situation of the Portuguese. However, both their objectives and the outcome of their efforts remain unclear. So too does the conduct of the hostages. The sources abound in such vague fragments. The Venetian merchant Ca da Mosto, we are told, appreciated the beauty of a young slave girl whom he received from Budomel as a gift. But after sending her away to his caravel, he never spoke of her again.[9] The attractiveness of an African slave girl drew the attention of Hieronim Münzer who wrote in a letter dated to around 1495 that 'Martin Behaim's father-in-law has a beautiful slave girl whom I had the opportunity to see'.[10] Eustache Delafosse, in turn, described how

---

[6] Gomes Eanes de Zurara, *Crónica dos feitos notáveis que se passaram na conquista de Guiné por mandado do Infante D. Henrique*, ed. Torquato de Sousa Soares, 2 vols, Lisbon, 1981, vol. 2, p. 86 ('por ali acudir algum homem ou mulher que eles pudessam filar'), p. 87 ('viram ir uma moura negra, que era serva daqueles que ficavam no outeiro'). Translation from *The Chronicle of the Discovery and Conquest of Guinea written by Gomes Eanes de Azurara*, ed. Charles R. Beazley and Edgar Prestage, 2 vols, New York, 1896, vol. 1, pp. 41, 43. In the most often quoted French translation: Gomes Eanes de Zurara, *Chronique de Guinée*, ed. and trans. Léon Bourdon, Dakar, 1960, pp. 80–81.

[7] Zurara–Soares, *Crónica*, pp. 119, 179; Zurara–Bourdon, *Chronique*, pp. 119–125; for the dating of the expedition see n. 5.

[8] Zurara–Soares, *Crónica*, pp. 196, 197 ('Mas se isto era enganosamente cometido, ou se a natureza maliciosa de si mesma o constrangia, fique ao encargo de cada um o determinar como lhe bem pareça'); Zurara–Beazley, *The Chronicle*, vol. 1, p. 111.

[9] *Le navigazioni atlantiche del Veneziano Alvise Da Mosto*, ed. Tullia Gasparrini Leporace, Rome, 1966, *Il Nuovo Ramusio*, vol. 5, p. 50.

[10] Hieronim Münzer, 'De inventione Africae maritimae et occidentalis videlicet

some women from the settlement of Aldeia das Duas Partes enticed him into a hut and cast a spell on him. As a result, he lost two copper basins he had planned to sell.[11]

The intimate sphere was usually omitted from various accounts. It was quite exceptional for Zurara to include in his text the scene where African women lure the Portuguese. It testifies to the intense emotions that the incident must have aroused. All we know for sure is that the Portuguese tended to recognize the attractiveness of African women, being at the same time afraid that they might want to lure them into a trap, to cast a spell on them, or perpetrate some other ruse. In a typical medieval fashion, Zurara attributed an intrinsically wicked nature to those women.

Women also appear in historical sources as victims of slave hunting. The sources contain descriptions of both the tragedies they experienced as well as the courage some of them displayed during such 'hunts'. Zurara's chronicle describes the despair and resistance of a woman being taken into captivity. As she kept wrenching herself from her captors' grasp, making it impossible for them to take her to their caravel, they tied her up and left her in the woods, so they could freely continue their hunt for other Africans. As it turned out, the hunters did not have enough time to return for her later. Consequently, she must have been devoured by wild animals.[12] Zurara also described the bravery of another woman whose resistance ended up in a profoundly moving decision. In 1445 or 1446, Alvaro Fernandes was in command of an expedition to Africa. After passing the Green Cape/Cabo Verde, the caravel reached Cabo dos Mastos.[13] Sailing along the coast, the Portuguese occasionally went ashore in search of booty. One day, they saw a group of women collecting shellfish at a creek.

Geneae per Infantem Heinricum Portugalliae', in Friedrich Kunstmann, 'Hieronymus Münzer's Bericht über die Entdeckung der Guinea', *Abhandlungen der Historischer Classe der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 7, 1855, pp. 290–362 (pp. 348–62), about the beautiful slave girl p. 352: '[...] socer domini Martini Bohemi habet unam pulchram schlavam, quam ego vidi.'

[11] *Voyage d'Eustache Delafosse sur la côte de Guinée, au Portugal et en Espagne (1479–1481)*, ed. Denis Escudier, Paris, 1992, p. 30.

[12] Zurara-Soares, *Crónica*, p. 413.

[13] The identification of the cape is open to debate. See Zurara–Bourdon, *Chronique*, p. 212 n. 1; Avelino Teixeira da Mota, 'Cronologia e âmbito das viagens portuguesas de descoberla na África Ocidental, de 1445 a 1462', *Boletim Cultural da Guiné Portuguesa*, 2, 1947, 6, pp. 315–41, on Cabo dos Mastos: p. 318; idem, *Toponimos de origem portuguesa na costa ocidental de África desde o Cabo Bojador ao Cabo de Santa Catarina*, Bissau, 1950, pp. 99–102, also offers a different identification of the cape, but both his proposals concern places located close to each other — south of Cabo Verde and before the Salum rivier estuary.

> They captured one of them, who would be as much as thirty years of age, with a son of hers who would be of about two, and also a young girl of fourteen years, who had well-formed limbs and also a favourable presence for a Guinea; but the strength of the woman was much to be marvelled at, for not one of the three men who came upon her but would have had a great labour in attempting to get her to the boat. And so one of our men, seeing the delay they were making, during which it might be that some of the dwellers of the land would come upon them, conceived it well to take her son from her and to carry him to the boat; and love of the child compelled the mother to follow after it, without great pressure on the part of the two who were bringing her.[14]

Zurara's account tends to praise the ingenuity displayed by one of the slave hunters in dealing with the captured women. Perhaps the chronicler faithfully retold the story he had heard from the participants of the expedition and, consequently, his account reflects more their view of the event than it does his. Zurara did not try to comment on the event in any direct way. Contrasted with the mother's love for her child, the Portuguese knights' cruelty and ruthlessness is felt to be particularly appalling. Notably, the scene also includes the motif of the admiration for the attractiveness of the captured girl.

Two authors described spectacular escapes attempted by some of the women whom the Portuguese had managed to capture. Attempts to break free from the hands of their persecutors were just further proof of the courage and determination African women were capable of showing. According to Zurara, in 1445, during the expedition led by Lanzarote, a Moorish girl who had been taken captive 'threw herself into the water, and like one practised in that kind of thing very quickly got to land and joined her relations and her friends'.[15] Not so lucky was another slave girl who in 1480 tried to take advantage of the stopover of a few caravels on a small island near the Cape Sierra Leone. She went ashore, hid, and waited for the

[14] Zurara-Soares, *Crónica*, p. 495–96 ('e tomaram una delas que teria de idade uns 30 anos, com um seu filho que seria de dois; e assim uma moça de 14, na qual havia assaz boa postura de membros e, ainda, presence razoàvel para giuné [que era]. Mas a força da mulher era assaz para maravilhar, pois de três que se ajuntaram a ela, não havia nenhum que não tivesse bastante trabalho querendo-a levar ao batel; vendo a detença que faziam (na qual, poderia acontecer sobrechegarem alguns daqueles moradores da terra), houve um deles a resolução de lhe tomar o filho, e levá-lo ao batel; cujo amor forçou a mãe a ir-se após ele, sem muito esforço dos dois que a levavam'); Zurara–Beazley, *The Chronicle*, vol. 2, pp. 259–60.

[15] Zurara-Soares, *Crónica*, p. 389 ('a moura... lançou-se à água, e como acustumada em aquele trabalho, em mui breve tempo saiu em terra, entre seus parentes e amigos'); Zurara–Beazley, *The Chronicle*, vol. 2, p. 205.

caravels to set sail again. She then dived into the water and started swimming in the direction of the mainland. However, it turned out that she left her hiding place too early. The caravel crews discerned the women swimming and sent a boat after her. She was thus enslaved once again.[16]

Such successful or unsuccessful escapes, effective or ineffective resistance, must have taken place quite often. However, the actions of these women captured the attention of eyewitnesses or chroniclers. Europeans must have considered their conduct to be at odds with the way in which women were stereotypically expected to behave. As such, these events must been highly unusual. Tales of escapes by men were omitted from accounts of European expeditions in Africa — where male Africans were concerned, the chroniclers' interest lay definitely in the recounting of their armed clashes with the Portuguese.

The examples we have seen above refer to some isolated cases, and therefore provide no sound basis for generalizations. However, what can safely be ascertained here is that in the earliest expeditionary period, Europeans noted the attractiveness of African women and appreciated their value as slaves. It was also their impressive and unusual behaviour — so far removed from European stereotypes of women's behaviour — that aroused their interest. Moreover, the Portuguese considered these women to be dangerous, as they could be used as bait in potential ambushes.

An opportunity to learn more about African women arose when the Portuguese chose to establish commercial links with Africans. Participants in the expeditions and authors of the chronicles were particularly interested in, and often truly excited about, polygamy among the Africans.[17] Zurara did not mention anything about this custom, as the witnesses he relied upon had not yet had the opportunity to learn anything about this form of African social life. What was impossible in the case of Zurara became possible for Ca da Mosto who observed and described polygamy among the Wolofs. The Venetian author wrote that 'The King is permitted to have as many wives as he wishes, as also are all the chiefs and men of this country, that is, as many as they can support. Thus King has always thirty of them, though he favours one more than another, according to those from whom they are descend and the rank of the lords whose daughters they are'.[18] Ca da Mosto perspicaciously observed that polygamy did

[16] *Voyage d'Eustache Delafosse*, p. 38.

[17] José da Silva Horta, 'A Representação do Africano na literatura de Viagens, do Senegal à Serra Leoa (1453–1508)', *Mare Liberum*, 1991, 2, pp. 209–338; on polygamy, see pp. 321–22.

[18] Ca da Mosto–Leporace, *Le navigazioni*, pp. 42–43 ('A questo re è licito tenir quanta muier el vole; — e cossì etami a tuti li signori et homini de quel paexe: cadauno ne

not imply all men had many wives. Possessing many wives was an option available only to those who could afford it. Thus, while there were men with numerous wives, there were also those who had no wives at all. Ca da Mosto also added:

> He has certain villages and places, in some of which he keeps eight or ten of them. Each has a house of her own, with young servants to attend her, and slaves to cultivate the possessions and lands assigned by the lord [...]. When the king arrives at one of these villages, he goes to the house of one of his wives, for they are obliged to provide, out of this produce, for him and those accompanying him. [...] In this fashion he journeys from place to place without giving any thought to his victuals, and lodges sometimes with one wife, sometimes with another [...]. All the other chiefs of this country live in this same fashion.[19]

In Kayor, the Wolofs' state ruled by Budomel, the ruler's estates — noted Ca da Mosto — were organized along similar lines, with many wives entrusted with the task of administering them. The Venetian stayed in one of the ruler's places of residence.

> In this place Budomel had nine wives: and likewise in his other dwellings, according to his will and pleasure. Each of this wives has five or six young negro girls in attendance upon her, and it is as lawful for the lord to sleep with these attendants upon her, and it is as lawful for the lord to sleep with these attendants as with his wives, to whom this does not appear any injury, for it is customary. In this way the lord changes frequently. These negroes, both men and women, are exceedingly lascivious [...].

---

pol tenir quante el vol, a quanta el puol far le spexe; — e cossì questo re ne ha sempre da 30 in suso, e fa però più stima de una cha de un'altra, secondo le persoe de chi le son dessesse e de la grandeza de'segnori de chi le son fiole'). For the English translation of Ca da Mosto's account I draw on the volume edited by Gerald R. Crone, *The Voyages of Cadamosto and Other Documents on Western Africa in the Second Half of the 15th century*, London, 1937, p. 30.

[19] Ca da Mosto–Leporace, *Le navigazioni*, pp. 43–44 ('el à certi vilazi e luogi suoi, nei qualli in algum luogo el ne tien 8 o 10, e altratante in uno altro luogo, e cossì de luogo in luogo. E chadauna de queste soe mugiere sta da per sé in chassa, e hano cadauna de esse tante femene zovene che le serve, et etiam hanno tanti schiavi per chadauna, i qualli lavorano certe possessione e tereni che'l dito signor de queste soe muier azoché de le intrade de queste terre se possano mantegnir; [...] E quando l'acade che'l dito re va ad alguno di prediti vilazi, el non porta direto né vituaria né altra cossa, perché dove el va, quelle soe muiere che là se atrovano sono obligate a farli le spexe a lui e a tuti li soi che mena con lui [...] E per questo modo el va de luogo in luogo [...] El va a dormir con una quando con l'altra de le dite soe muiere, e cresce in molto numero de fioli [...] E per questo medemo modo de sopra viveno li altri signori de quel paexe'). Translation from Ca da Mosto–Crone, *The Voyages*, pp. 30–31.

Writing about Wolofs' manners, Ca da Mosto noticed that local women were cheerful and very much liked dancing.[20]

Diogo Gomes also briefly referred to polygamy,[21] while further information on the topic is provided by Valentim Fernandes. In his opinion the Mandingos' customs were similar to those followed by the Wolofs. It was probably Ca da Mosto to whom they owed the information that the Mandingos' 'King and even everyone one else may have as many wives as he wishes and is able to buy', and that the ruler's wives are required to support his retinue.[22] Fernandes supplemented the account of the ruler's relations with his numerous wives with the 'succession principle — each night with a different wife'. Devoted to the Mandingos was also the paragraph in which the author described the custom of buying wives. He pointed out that 'a male Mandingo can marry every woman with the exception of his mother and sister'. He also contended that one could dissolve one's marriage by returning the woman to the family from which she came, and by regaining the money with which she had been bought.[23]

Europeans were interested in polygamy for a variety of reasons. First of all, the practice ran counter to the Christian principle of monogamy. In Portugal, in the period under discussion, bigamy was severely punished. The culprit was sentenced to death, with the sentence being sometimes commuted to banishment to Africa.[24] The most extensive and perspicacious among the accounts of West African polygamy is that offered by Ca da

[20] Ca da Mosto–Leporace, *Le navigazioni*, p. 53 ('In questo luogo Bodumel havea nove muiere; e altre molte muiere el tien, che sono repartide, como ho dito, in più luogi. E chadauna de queste soe muiere ha 5 over 6 garzone negre, che le serve; et è licito al signor de dormir cossi con le serve de la muier como con le muiere medesseme; né le dite soe muiere non hano per inzuria, per esser cossi la costuma: per questo el predito Bodumel muda ogni note pasto. E sono questi Negri e Negre molto luxuriosi [...]'). Translation from Ca da Mosto–Crone, *The Voyages*, p. 38. The information on women's cheerful disposition and dancing, Ca da Mosto–Leporace, *Le navigazioni*, p. 70.

[21] *De la première découverte de la Guinée récit par Diogo Gomes (fin XV^e siècle)*, ed. Theodore Monod, Raymond Mauny, G. Duval, texte latin et traduction française, Bissau, 1959, p. 45.

[22] *Description de la Côte Occidentale d'Afrique (Sénégal au Cap de Monte, Archipels) par Valentim Fernandes (1506–1510)*, ed. Theodore Monod, Avelino Teixeira da Mota and Raymond Mauny, Bissau, 1951, p. 40 ('Elrey ou outro qualquer pode ter quãtas molheres qui ser e pode cõprar').

[23] Fernandes, *Description*, p. 48 ('Cõ todas casã tirado may e jrmãos, toda outro nõ stranham').

[24] *Portugaliae Monumenta Africana*, ed. Luis de Albuquerque and Maria E. Madeira Santos, vols 1–3, 5, Lisbon, 1993–95 (hereafter *PMA*), vol. 2, pp. 43–44, doc. no. 22, 12 May 1490 — the commutation of Gomes Aires' death sentence for the crime of bigamy to banishment of unlimited duration to the island of São Tomé.

Mosto. The Venetian author revealed a political function of polygamy by indicating that women to whom rulers were married came from important families, the marriage thus being one way in which rulers forged alliances with other families. He also highlighted its economic dimension by observing that rulers' wives were entrusted with the administration of the slave villages. Ca da Mosto also attempted to look at polygamy from both the social and psychological points of view. He remarked that it was in tune with general customs and that women not only accepted the institution, but also did not protest against their husbands having sexual relationships with their servants. It was only in conclusion that he attempted to pass a moral judgment on polygamy, accepting a European point of view and stressing the promiscuity and lasciviousness of the Wolofs.

The views held by the Wolofs, as well as the way in which they perceived Europeans, must have been the mirror image of the views held by Europeans. Budomel asked Ca da Mosto about the ways of satisfying many women with which European newcomers were acquainted.[25] He must have assumed that the latter were particularly competent in this regard — competent and promiscuous. He probably convinced himself of European promiscuity while watching some newcomers disembark from their ships and try to make direct contact with African women.

It is Valentim Fernandes who wrote more about the relations between the Portuguese and African women. According to Fernandes,

> If any of our white men stays in the house of a black man, even of the king, and asks the host for a woman or a girl, he is presented with several women out of whom he may choose those he is going to sleep with — all of this happening not through coercion but out of consideration for good friendship. And it is the father of the girl chosen who takes her by the hand and gives her to the white man. The father also does not protest when the white man wants to sleep with her sisters.[26]

These remarks were written in the early sixteenth century. By that time, there had already developed a form of informal code of conduct (gestures, forms of behaviour) to be followed in the establishment of these types of temporary relationships between the Portuguese men and African women.

[25] Ca da Mosto–Leporace, *Le navigazioni*, pp. 53–54.

[26] Fernandes, *Description*, p. 40 ('E se alguũ dos nossos Brãcos chegua a algũa casa de Negro e esso mesmo delrey e lhe pede qualquer molher ou filha mãda lhe q escolha qualquer dellas pera dormir cõ ellas e esto por boa amizade e nõ por força E ho pay mesmo lha ẽtregua cõ a mão aquella q elle escolheo e se quer dormir com mais irmãs tãbem lhas da').

Thus, the phenomenon described above probably dates back to the last decades of the fifteenth century.

The condemnation of African polygamy and the criticism of their promiscuity did not prevent Europeans from taking advantage of these sexual practices. While on a long expedition, far away from their own country, and in constant contact with people from other cultures, Europeans considered themselves justified in suspending moral norms which they otherwise held. African conduct, as well as the opinions they held, were probably, as we have already suggested, the reverse of the conduct and opinions of Europeans. The accepted norms of behaviour prevalent in African society did not necessarily emerge in the contacts with Europeans.

Fernandes points out that adultery was severely punished by the Mandingos, with the punishment being meted out to the seducing man. The husband who had been cuckolded could, with the consent of the ruler, cut the culprit's skin with a knife. A long cut on the back indicated a wrongdoing. Since people used to walk naked, says Fernandes, everybody saw the long scar.[27] The author does not say anything about how wives who were guilty of adultery were punished. Later sources, for example the account by Pieter de Marees, confirm that the way in which Africans treated sexual relations within their own society was different from the way in which they used to treat them with respect to Europeans.[28]

Fernandes's description testifies to a considerable increase in the number of sexual contacts between Europeans and Africans in comparison with the period described by Ca da Mosto and Diogo Gomes. Fernandes referred here to sexual relations maintained with unmarried women who were not coerced to have sex with Europeans. However, considering the fact that young girls must have felt socially constrained by parental power, the view that the sexual contacts in question were free of coercion does not seem to be justified. In any case, slaves do not feature in Fernandes's account and sexual abuse to which they may have fallen victim is not referred to in the earliest sources. It was not until the end of the fifteenth century that some authors began to allude to such situations. We shall return to this problem later.

The names of Africans — those of rulers, tribal chiefs, and their relatives — already appear in the sources recounting the earliest phase of

[27] Ibid.

[28] Pieter de Marees, *Beschryvinge ende historische verhael van het Gout koninckrijk van Gunea, anders de Gout-custe de Mina genaemt*, Amsterdam, 1602, preface and chapter 2 on marriages and chapter 7 on female behavior. English edition: Pieter de Marees, *Description and Historical Account of the Kingdom of Guinea (1602)*, ed. Albert van Dantzig, and Adam Jones, Oxford, 1987, pp. 11, 20–21, 37.

the Portuguese exploration of Africa. Occasionally chronicles mention the names of important warriors or even captives and slaves who distinguished themselves in some way. But there are no names of women — a small number of freed slaves are the only exceptions. Women who for some time maintained intimate relationships with Europeans remained nameless until the end of the fifteenth century. Their names began to appear at the beginning of the sixteenth century, after fifty years of contact between the Portuguese and Africans. This should be regarded as proof that they were treated instrumentally.

As we have already seen, Portuguese women did not take part in the first expeditions to Africa. However, it does not mean that the expeditions did not affect their lives. The wives of the knights who were killed in Africa were granted privileges that allowed them to maintain their social status. They were offered either land grants or special pensions (*teença*) paid by the royal treasury.[29] Even if a man were not killed in Africa, long separations often ended in a break-up of the family. In 1488 Ines Eanes was tried for eloping with a João Dias, having first got married to Alfonso Dias who died in Mina. Her marriage to Alfonso Dias was also illegal, as it turned out to be bigamous. Her lawful husband, Gonçalo Eanes, was still alive, although she had not seen him for a long time. Acting on behalf of the king, judges came to the conclusion that Ines's long separation from her husband, along with the life of uncertainty she had to live, should be counted as extenuating circumstances and decided to grant her a pardon.[30] Her case was not an isolated example. In 1490, Ines Pires, João Marinho's wife, was also tried for bigamy and was similarly pardoned. She remarried as her lawful husband stayed overseas as he had been exiled for five years. Her pardon was justified on the grounds that there were rumors of her husband's death at Mina fortress. He was to have been killed, along with other men gathered around a João Fagaça, in an unknown battle. Since the rumor was false, Ines Pires's marriage turned out to be bigamous.[31] In 1501 Margarida Fernandes, Alvaro Gil's widow — Gil had gone to Elmina — was granted a pardon. She was tried and convicted for adultery, but was then pardoned when it was revealed that her husband had died at Mina.[32] Long

[29] *PMA*, vol. 1, p. 39, doc. no. 10, 12 December 1453 — the granting of the pension (*teença*) to Pedro Anes Encerrabodes's widow. For more on such privileges see: Michał Tymowski, 'Death and Attitudes to Death at the Time of Early European Expeditions to Africa (15th Century)', *Cahiers d'Études africaines*, 54, 2014, 215 (3), pp. 787–811, on privileges: p. 802.

[30] *PMA*, vol. 1, pp. 408–09, doc. no. 207, 4 March 1488.

[31] *PMA*, vol. 2, pp. 48–49, doc. no. 25, 5 June 1490.

[32] *PMA*, vol. 3, p. 183, doc. no. 109, 11 October 1501.

separation from spouses who had gone to Africa — either of their own accord or as exiles — painfully affected the life of the wives.

The earliest information about women who travelled to Africa is connected with São Jorge da Mina castle. Six hundred men, including five hundred soldiers and one hundred craftsmen, took part in the expedition led by Diogo de Azambuja who in 1482 supervised the construction of the castle. A few women were assigned to the expedition, although their exact number remains unknown. In any case, after the castle had been built, Azambuja sent most members of the expedition back to Portugal, while he remained in Africa with sixty soldiers and three women. He spent two years and seven months in Mina organizing a trading post. These events are described in several sources,[33] but it was only Rui de Pina who offered some information about these women.[34]

The 12 July 1499 report, prepared by captain Lopo Soares and other officials who were about to leave their post at Mina, mentions seven women who stayed at the castle.[35] The women were not black slaves but the Portuguese sent to Mina as exiles (*degredadas*). According to Hair, such a punishment was usually meted out to prostitutes, not because they were prostitutes but because of the crimes they committed while plying their trade, such as theft.[36] Two documents, dated 1 February 1509 and 1 March 1509, contain the list of the castle's residents. The preparation of such a list was occasioned by the distribution of bread rations. The first document mentions as a separate category four women, giving both their first and second name. Catarina, Fernan d'Avila's wife, was put on the list separately. She and her husband are referred to as the king's slaves (*escravos del-Rei noso senhor*). It is likely that they were also *degredados* sent into exile

[33] Rui de Pina, *Crónica de el-Rei D. João II*, ed. Alberto Martins de Carvalho, Caimbra, 1950. Paragraphs concerning the construction of Mina in: *Monumenta Missionaria Africana*, vol. 1: *Africa Ocidental (1471–1531)*, ed. Antonio Brásio, Lisbon, 1952 (hereafter *MMA*), pp. 8–14, on women p. 14; João de Barros, *Ásia. Dos feitos que os Portugueses fizeram no descobrimento e conquista dos mares e terras do Oriente. Primeira década, sexta edição actualizada e anotada por Hernani Cidade, notas por Manuel Múrias*, Lisbon, 1945, Liv. 3, cap. 1–2, pp. 77–85; Duarte Pacheco Pereira, *Esmeraldo de situ orbis*, ed. Raymond Mauny, Bissau, 1956, pp. 120–23. All the sources are analysed and quoted — both in original and in English translation — by Hair, *The Founding*. See also, Michał Tymowski, 'Europeans and Africans in the Early Period of Portuguese Expansion in Africa — the Organization and Course of the First Encounters', *Hemispheres*, 25, 2010, pp. 95–122. For sources on the founding of the castle: pp. 99–100, 107–15.

[34] Pina, in *MMA*, p. 14; Hair, *The Founding*, pp. 36, 102; see also Pina in John W. Blake, *Europeans in West Africa, 1450–1560*, Nendeln, 1967, p. 77.

[35] *Descobrimentos portugueses*, ed. João Martins da Silva Marques, 3 vols, Lisbon, 1944–71, vol. 3, p. 525, 12 July 1499.

[36] Hair, *The Founding*, p. 92.

together as a married couple. Mina's captain, Afonso de Babadilha, appears in the list along with his wife and twenty-eight other persons who usually surrounded him. Other high ranking officials — factor (an official put in charge of a trading post), judge, and scribes — are mentioned without their wives. In total, the 1 February 1509 list contains seventy--eight men and six women.[37]

The list drawn up a month later includes 131 men and seven women. The group of six women mentioned above was joined by one further person. She came from Axim, along with a large group of men who considerably raised the total number of the castle's population.[38] With people on the move, the number of those who made up the garrison altered, but women were constantly outnumbered by men. While Diogo de Azambuja remained in command, there was one Portuguese woman for every twenty men, one woman for every thirteen men in February 1509, and one woman for every nineteen men on 1 March 1509.

In 1529 Emanuel I the Fortunate issued a decree (*regimento*) concerning the administration of São Jorge da Mina.[39] This *regimento* was based on a previous decree issued in 1506. Both documents are likely to have drawn on principles elaborated by Diogo de Azambuja. Both the 1506 decree and Azambuja's principles are now lost.[40] The 1529 document defines the rules and principles on which the life and work of European women staying in Mina were to be based. The women were referred to as *molheres solteiras*: that is, single and unmarried. The thirty-fifth paragraph explains their duties. They were supposed to work at the hospital and take care of the sick. They were also required to work in the bread ovens, mill flour, wash clothes, and perform a variety of other tasks. Just like the remaining members of the castle garrison, they were entitled to a daily ration of bread, oil and vinegar, as the documents from 1509 also inform us. They had slave women at their disposal. The high ranking officials were forbidden from monopolizing the services of the *molheres solteiras* under pain of losing their pay. In short, they could not use these women exclusively. The women, in turn, were forbidden — also under the threat of losing their pay — from working only for the officials, while

[37] *PMA*, vol. 5, pp. 490–94, doc. no. 130, 1 February 1509.

[38] *PMA*, vol. 5, pp. 504–09, doc. no. 138, 1 March 1509.

[39] The text of *Regimento* in Ballong-Wen-Mewuda, *São Jorge da Mina*, vol. 2, pp. 542–69. See also: Jorge Faro, 'Estêvão da Gama capitão de S. Jorge da Mina e a sua organização administrativa em 1529', *Boletim Cultural da Guiné Portuguesa*, 12, 1957, 47, pp. 385–442.

[40] David Birmingham, 'The Regimento de Mina', *Transactions of the Historical Society of Ghana*, 9, 1970, pp. 1–7; DeCorse, *An Archaeology*, pp. 36–37; Vogt, *Portuguese Rule*, p. 182.

they were also to be properly paid for working for the entire garrison.[41] There is no doubt that these regulations were issued as a response to the appropriation of the women's work or even their persons by high ranking officials. One can also hold serious doubts about how enforceable these rules were.

The paragraph discussing female working practices has provoked a scholarly discussion. Teixeira da Mota and later Hair claimed — their interpretation of the respective fragment being consistent with other sections of the *regimento* — that these 'other tasks' for which the women were to be paid were sexual in nature.[42] According to Ballong-Wen-Mewuda, this paragraph needs to be interpreted in a different way. In his opinion, the king stood guard over the women's chastity.[43] I find the interpretation put forward by Teixeira da Mota and Hair more convincing. It is more plausible, particularly in the context of the whole *regimento*. There can also be no doubt that a small number of women provoked tension and conflicts among the male garrison of the castle, both over ordinary household chores like washing and over their intimate life as well.

The *regimento* also reveals that the *molheres solteiras* were assigned African slave women on whose help they could rely. Undoubtedly, a general lack of female companionship led the castle's inhabitants to become increasingly interested in African women, both as slaves and free women. There are a few documents testifying that there were African slave women who, after living for some time in Portugal, were sent back to Africa in the king's service. The first dates from 1454. It says that Alfonso V would free a slave, Fatima, provided she went to Africa as his servant.[44] The second document is dated 20 April 1499 and states that Emanuel the Fortunate liberated one of his slaves, Beatriz Gomes.[45] Beatriz had probably been sent from Portugal to Mina where, after serving there for some time, she was liberated and granted the right to return and live in the kingdom. These were exceptional situations. There was no point in sending slave women from Portugal to Africa in order to burden them with household tasks. Those African slave women who were sent from Europe to Africa probably served as interpreters, while those entrusted with mundane jobs were placed in the castle right after being captured or purchased in Africa.

---

[41] *Regimento*, capitulos 35, 36, 37.

[42] Mota, *Some Aspects*, pp. 10–11; Hair, *The Founding*, p. 92.

[43] Ballong-Wen-Mewuda, *São Jorge da Mina*, p. 267.

[44] *PMA*, vol. 1, doc. no. 11, 17 May 1454, p. 40; it was also published in *Monumenta Henricina*, ed. Antônio Joaquim Dias, 15 vols, Coimbra, 1960–74, vol. 11, p. 351.

[45] *PMA*, vol. 2, doc. no. 239, p. 407.

The 1519 document enumerates African slave women working at the castle, as it does their duties and some of their owners.[46] Magdalena, Isabel, Margarida with her son, and Antonia with her two sons worked at the bread ovens. Catarina, Margerida and Cristova served in the captain's house. Catarina, Francisca, and Catarina's daughter served in the house of the factor. Ines, with her daughter, worked in Pedro de Seixas's house. Mecia and her daughter were in the service of the people referred to as residents. Brizida and her two daughters remained in the service of a judge (*alcaide-mor*). Maria Velha was also in the service of residents, as were two other Marias. Garcia worked with her four sons at the bread ovens, while Francisca and her daughter served in Francisco de Seixas's house, and Guimara with her son worked for residents.

Thus, we have evidence that eighteen African slaves served in the houses of high ranking officials and ordinary members of the garrison (that is probably how the term 'residents' needs to be understood). We know about some of their duties, especially at ovens. The remaining slave women worked as domestic servants. Nine slave women had children, some of them two, and one of them as many as four. This is proof that their owners, and perhaps other people as well, abused them sexually. Children, or at least some of them, were not taken away from their mothers and sold. The children were also slaves. One of the daughters, clearly older than the remaining children, worked — just like her mother — as a servant. If the children were the offspring of a slave owner, they could be liberated, their liberation probably taking place at an older age when they were no longer in their mother's care. At any rate, the document clearly proves that some slave women were placed in the houses of their owners for whom they worked and for whom they provided a variety of services, including, perhaps, sexual ones. The presence of these women made the gender ratio at least a little less unfavourable to men. As a consequence, there also appeared at Mina, and indeed at other places where the Portuguese stayed a group of mulattos, although they are not mentioned in the 1519 document. Their existence is attested to in later sources, and I shall return to this problem.

In São Jorge da Mina it was also possible for Europeans to maintain relationships with free African women. The early evidence is to be found in the account of Eustache Delafosse's journey to the coast of Mina in 1481 — the castle São Jorge da Mina had not yet been built — to the settlement called

[46] The quotation from the 1519 document follows Ballong-Wen-Mewuda, *São Jorge da Mina*, vol. 1, pp. 267–68. The document comes from the Archive of Torre do Tombo, corpo cronologico II-85-75, fol. 13.

Aldeia das Dues Partes. We have already mentioned how the merchant of Bruges was seduced by local women.[47] However, a small dictionary which Delafosse included in his account offers a more telling testimony in this regard. Among few words existing in the Akan and Mande languages there is a word *chocque-chocque* which means making love.[48] According to studies carried out by Hair and David Dalby the word is not derived from any of the African languages. Instead, it is a Portuguese slang term for sexual intercourse which was also used in Angola and Morocco.[49] A merchant of Bruges, probably a Fleming, Delafosse did not understand Portuguese and took *chocque-chocque* for an African word, not least because it was also used by the women who were trying to seduce him.

The Portuguese reached the coast of Mina in 1471. As Delafosse's account shows, it took only ten years for this word to become embedded in the local language. This is evidence that the newcomers (who arrived in Mina Coast for only a short stay) were quick to establish intimate relations with local women. In 1482, in the village visited by Delafosse, the Portuguese built a castle which was to be constantly occupied by several dozen men. From that moment on the contacts in question only intensified. An African village grew under the walls of the castle. The castle soldiers visited the village in search of sexual partners, both regular and casual. If a couple established a permanent relationship, it was considered a marriage. In the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries there were many mulattos born to such couples. They served as intermediaries in contacts between Africans and Europeans.[50]

There is evidence that points to the existence of sexual relationships between African women and European men, and even European women and African men — the latter being rare due to the small number of European women travelling to Africa — from the very beginning of the settlement of the island of São Tomé. According to Valentim Fernandes, when both spouses were white, the women did not get pregnant. It was mixed marriages that had children — regardless of whether it was a wife who was black or a husband (*muito mais poré as aluas das negros e as negras dos*

[47] *Voyage d'Eustache Delafosse*, pp. 28, 30.

[48] Ibid.

[49] David Dalby and Paul Hair, 'A Further Note on the Mina Vocabulary of 1479–1480', *Journal of West African Languages*, 2, 1968, p. 131 n. 14.

[50] de Marees–Dantzig–Jones, *Description*, p. 26 n. 3; Vogt, *Portuguese Rule*, pp. 179, 182; DeCorse, *An Archaeology*, p. 37; Harvey Feinberg, *Africans and Europeans in West Africa: Elminas and Dutchmen on the Gold Coast during the Eighteenth Century*, Philadelphia, PA, 1989, pp. 36, 88–92.

homés aluos).[51] This remark referred to the group of two thousand Jewish children, none of which were older than eight years of age, sent to the island in 1492. Six hundred managed to survive the harsh climate and came of age. One might guess that the situation was similar for other mixed couples, with the difference being that among the Portuguese who, either of their own accord or as exiles, travelled to the island, men overwhelmingly outnumbered women. The gender ratio among the Jewish children must have been more balanced.

Fernandes notes that one thousand Portuguese inhabited the island at the beginning of the sixteenth century. Only some of them were there of their own accord. Some came to the island from Guinea for commercial purposes, and they stayed there for only a short time. Exiles made up the largest group of the island's inhabitants (*pore os mais som os degredados*).[52] The king ordered that all who arrived on the island as a *degredado* were to receive a slave who would help them. It was for each *degredado* to decide whether they wanted to rely on the assistance of a male or female slave. Some *degredados* became wealthy enough to have fourteen or more slaves. The slaves grew yams and millet for their masters. Fernandes estimated that there must have been about two thousand slaves living on the island permanently. Moreover, there were about five or six thousand slaves staying on the island for a brief period of time while waiting to be sold elsewhere.[53] The information given by Fernandes is confirmed in the document from 4 November 1508. The document is an inventory of property owned by Alvaro Borges who died on the island of São Tomé. Added to the inventory is the list of the items that were sold on 8, 15, and 25 November of that year.[54]

The inventory clearly shows that Borges had ten female slaves and eight male slaves. All female slaves that belonged to the deceased and remained on the island for a longer period of time had one or two children. The only childless slaves were those who had been brought to the island relatively recently. The first slave woman to be mentioned in the inventory was one 'by the name of Jabell, along with her one year old son, a mulatto — the son of Lop Eanes to whom she — as a slave of the

[51] Fernandes, *Description*, p. 118; see also Pina–Carvalho, *Crónica*, cap. 150; Raymond Mauny, 'Le Judaïsme, les Juifs et l'Afrique Occidentale', *Bulletin IFAN*, 3–4, 1949, pp. 354–78.

[52] Fernandes, *Description*, p. 120.

[53] Ibid.

[54] *PMA*, vol. 5, p. 221–43, doc. no. 89, 4 November 1508 ('Item primarremente hũa escrava por nome Jabell com filho mulatto de hum anno filho de Lop'Eanes a quall escrava sse achou que era del-Rei nosso senhor que lhe tynham dado de ordenado').

king, our lord — had been made over according to the king's decrees'. We do not know how Alvaro Borges became the owner of the slave women and her son. The document did not include Jabell and her son among the group of slaves who were sold. Perhaps, which is unlikely, they were sold nameless, or, quite the contrary, they were freed. One way or another, the document attests to a relationship between a white man and a black woman. The relationship, as well as the resulting son, were not a secret, nor were they frowned upon. Moreover, it was not her owner, but another man who fathered her son. He was her previous owner. A young mulatto by the name of Bras was among those who attempted to purchase the property left by Alvaro Borges, and it was mainly slaves that were bought.[55] This illustrates that it was possible for children born to mixed couples to be freed and pursue lucrative business ventures.

These isolated cases known from the 1508 document are attested to as quite typical in the description of the journey from Lisbon to the São Tomé by an anonymous Portuguese pilot. The text was written around 1535, but it is only the sixteenth century Italian translation that survives, which was printed in 1550 in the Ramusio collection.[56] According to the pilot, São Tomé was permanently inhabited by 600–700 families, including merchants of various descent. So there were, among others, Portuguese, Castilian, Genoese, and French merchants. Whoever wanted to live on the island was welcomed.

> They all have wives and children, and some of the children who are born there are as white as ours. It sometimes happens that when the wife of merchant dies he takes a negress and this is an accepted practice, as the negro population is both intelligent and rich; the children of such unions are brought up to our customs and way of dressing. Children born of these negresses have lighter skin, [are mischievous and difficult to manage] and are called *Mulati* (mulatoes).[57]

[55] Ibid., p. 240.

[56] 'Navigazione da Lisbona all'isola di San Tomé', in Giovanni Battista Ramusio, *Navigazioni e viaggi*, ed. Marica Milanesi, vol. 1, Turin, 1978, pp. 565–88; see also Rinaldo Caddeo, *Le navigazioni atlantiche di Alvise da Ca' da Mosto, Antoniotto Usodimare e Niccoloso da Recco*, Milano, 1928, pp. 297–328. For an English translation see Blake, *Europeans in West Africa*, pp. 145–66 and for the French see Serge Sauvageot, 'Navigation de Lisbonne à l'Ile São Tomé par un pilote portugais anonyme (vers 1545)', *Garcia de Orta*, 9, 1961, pp. 123–38.

[57] 'Navigazione', p. 578: '[...] e tutti hanno moglie e figliuoli. E sono quelli che nascono in detta isola bianchi come noi, ma alle volte accade che detti marcatanti, morendoli le mogli bianche, ne prendono delle negre: nel che non vi fanno troppo difficulta, essendovi abiatori negri di grande intellecto e ricchi, che allevano le loro figliuole al modo nostro nell costumi e nel vestire. E quelli che nasco di queste tal

Marriages between African women and the so-called *lançados* — the Portuguese who fled to Africa where they were beyond the reach of royal power — present a separate category.[58] One of the motives that stood behind such escapes — apart from the intention to get away with a crime, to win freedom, to profit from conducting some trade, or to embark on an exciting adventure — was the search for women. *Lançados* preserved their ability to speak Portuguese, while the women they were with enabled them to develop close ties to African clans.[59] Their wives played an important role in organizing trade relations between the Portuguese and Africans. They served as interpreters and provided their husbands with information on local customs.[60] Gradually *lançados* adopted many elements of the African culture in which they operated, including local beliefs. Children born out of such relationships acquired a knowledge of both cultures — that of the father and the mother. Consequently, there appeared a distinct ethnic group of Luso-Africans speaking crioulo, that is, a simplified Portuguese.[61]

Figures of African women were one of the common topics of the sculptures created by the people Sapi (Temne) from Sierra Leone which is where many *lançados* settled. They served as agents for trade with the Portuguese, with ivory sculptures serving as an important product. These were salt cellars, spoons and knife handles. Sometimes whole tusks were covered with carvings. Images of African women appeared particularly on salt cellars. The sculptures presented women performing different roles. Sometimes they were shown accompanying men and they were occassionally depicted alone, while some of the images are profoundly erotic.[62]

---

negre sono berrettini, e vengono chiamati mulati.' The remarks concerning difficulties in raising children are absent from the Ramusio edition prepared by M. Milanesi and based on the first 1550 edition. Blake, *Europeans in West Africa*, p. 157, includes the remarks in his translation: 'Children born of these negresses are mischievous and difficult to manage, and are called Mulati [mulatoes].' The information about the lighter colour of these children's skin is omitted from Blake's translation. This highlights the discrepancies between the first and the second edition of 1554 (p. 145).

[58] Walter Rodney, *A History of the Upper Guinea Coast 1545–1800*, Oxford, 1970, pp. 74–94; Maria da Graça Garcia Nolasco da Silva, 'Subsidios para o estudo dos "lançados" na Guiné', *Boletim Cultural da Guiné Portuguesa*, 25, 1970, no. 97, pp. 25–40, no. 98, pp. 217–32, no. 99, pp. 397–420, no. 100, pp. 513–60; Jean Boulègue, *Les Luso-africains de Sénégambie, XVI^e–XIX^e siècles*, Lisbon, 1989; George Brooks, *Landlords and Strangers: Ecology, Society and Trade in Western Africa, 1000–1630*, Boulder, CO, 1993, passim.

[59] Mota, *Some Aspects*, p. 8; Peter Mark, *Portuguese Style and Luso-African Identity: Precolonial Senegambia, Sixteenth–Nineteenth Centuries*, Bloomington, IN, 2002.

[60] See works by Havik quoted in footnote 4.

[61] Boulègue, *Les Luso-africains*; Mark, *Portuguese Style*.

[62] William B. Fagg, *Afro-Portuguese Ivories*, London, 1959, p. X ('representation of a woman blatantly displaying her sexual organs'), also il. 1, 4, 5; Ezio Bassani and

These iconographic sources are in line with written accounts, and therefore enhance the credibility of the latter.

Thus, in the early period of the cultural encounter between Europeans and Africans, women from both sides performed numerous roles. African women can be regarded as playing the role of victims of slave hunting, but also of symbols of brave resistance. They also played the role of real, or alleged, seductresses who attempted to lure white assailants into traps. After the contacts stabilized, the female role became that of occasional mistresses or of regular partners of castle inhabitants at São Jorge da Mina. They were also the wives of *lançados*, which enabled them to establish contacts within African societies. Finally they were mothers of mulattos, a distinct group that also made contacts across the ethnic divide easier.

Portuguese women did not participate in the earliest expeditions to Africa, although the expeditions affected their lives. They were the victims of long periods separated from their husbands. Some of those women passively resigned themselves to their fate, while others tried to find a way out of their difficult situation. However, few European women travelled to Africa. Those who did assumed a double role. At first, these women were *degredadas*, sent into exile either to the São Jorge da Mina castle or to the island of São Tomé where they were supposed to serve the Portuguese garrison, which included sexual acts. Black slave women freed in Portugal were sent back to Africa as interpreters. Still less numerous were the wives of Portuguese officials travelling with their husbands to Mina or to São Tomé. The number of free Portuguese women staying in Africa was also very small.

Initially, the vast majority of women representing both sides of the contacts in question acted under coercion. This is most obviously seen with regard to black slave women captured in Africa and Portuguese women sent there into exile. Once contacts were established on a more regular basis, resulting in the development of trade between the Portuguese and Africans, the number of black slave women increased. At the same time, there appeared a large number of African women who came into contact with Europeans of their own accord. A small group of those women inhabited the area around São Jorge da Mina fortress and around Axim. The most numerous were the wives of the *lançados*,

---

William B. Fagg, *Africa and the Rennaissance: Art in Ivory*, New York, 1988, catalogue no. 8, and il. 43, p. 66 and detail il. 156, p. 124 and catalogue no. 16 and il. 186, p. 145 — both illustrations show carved saltcellars of Sapi. The first represents women performing sexual gestures. The second shows women accompanying men.

whose position was particularly strong, since they lived in their own environment while the Portuguese fugitives were new to it.

A great number of women were treated instrumentally, which is clearly attested to by the fact that their names were never mentioned. Women banished to Africa or freed on the condition they went to the Africa were the exception. Both banishment and liberation required taking legal action which, in turn, resulted in the production of documentation by respective offices. Also known were the names of wives of the Portuguese high ranking officials and sometimes the names of distinguished wives of *lançados*. As is often the case with respect to other epochs and other continents, in Africa of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries the sources give the names of people from the top and bottom of the social hierarchy. The names of ordinary people, those in the middle, including the vast majority of both European and African women, remain unknown.

The descriptions of women to be found in the sources relating to the period under discussion — whether individual persons or those representing social groups — are one-sided. This one-sidedness is overwhelming and much greater than that typifying the descriptions of both Europeans and African. Moreover, we have only European sources at our disposal, each written exclusively by a man. No woman left either a written account or an artistic representation of the events dealt with here. Not only do women participating in the Portuguese-African contacts remain anonymous, but no source survives which records their own point of view. There is also no evidence of the activities the women were involved in for long periods of time. A group of *lançados*'s wives is an exception. This group is known to have been active for a few centuries. Usually, we have to content ourselves with the knowledge of a brief episode in the lives of particular women which a given source happened to record. Besides, it is always a male opinion. These historical accounts present male points of view because men were always the authors.

As a result, there remain many questions to which we cannot find answers. Despite these limitations, we are able to say that women played an important role in cultural encounters between Europeans and Africans and to a great extent affected the conduct of men taking part in these contacts.

(Translated by Artur Mękarski)

Summary

The author's aim is to describe and analyse the role of women in the early Portuguese expeditions to West Africa. Women did not participate in the first expeditions. For the first few decades the expeditions were the domain of young, risk-taking men. A small number of women appeared in Africa in the last quarter of the fifteenth century as the so-called *degredadas* began to be sent to São Jorge da Mina castle and St Tomé island. The author analyses chronicle accounts and legal regulations referring to women sent into exile in the Dark Continent. African women, in the period of armed raids and plunder,were carried away into captivity. Thus, in the early phase of the Portuguese expeditions, most women acted under coercion. This concerns both slave women as well as *degredadas*. Few women are mentioned by their names in historical sources. Most remain nameless, which proves that they were treated instrumentally. In the second half of the fifteenth century, as the relations with Africans stabilized and trade began to grow, women were given new social and economic roles to play in European-African contacts. Both free and slave African women entered into relationships with European newcomers. African wives, the so-called *lançados*, became quite independent.

(Translated by Artur Mękarski)

Kwartalnik Historyczny
Vol. CXXI, 2014
Special Issue, pp. 71–93
PL ISSN 0023-5903

PAWEŁ T. DOBROWOLSKI
Collegium Civitas, Warsaw

BY COACH TO THE SCAFFOLD: THEATRES OF REMORSE IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY LONDON

In Memory of Bronisław Geremek

On Wednesday 14 January 1767 the London businessman Samuel Orton began his last journey. It lasted several hours and led from the condemned's cell in Newgate Gaol to Tyburn, the usual place of execution for the capital's criminals. He did not travel alone. On the two carts which followed him were carried the twenty-six-year-old Thomas Thornhill, called Captain because of his earlier military service, and two equally young sailors, Walker and Johnston.[1] Orton led the procession not only because he was older (forty-three years old) and because of his higher social position than the other condemned men. He travelled to his death in a different kind of vehicle, a 'mourning coach', which was suitably emphasized by the press reports. What was the meaning of this difference, given that at the end of the journey all four faced the same punishment: public execution by hanging? Should we read into this traces of 'class' distinctions in English society, which were already clearly visible in the middle of the eighteenth century and which were demonstrated even in such particular circumstances? Such an interpretation would correspond with the well known theses of the historians linked to the 'Warwick school', which has interpreted the English penal system through the prism of the dominant paradigm of the 'owners' of the law and plebeians, casting the latter as the victims of its operation.[2] A close reading of the reports of this execution

[1] *London Magazine*, 36, 1767, p. 41. It's competitor, the *Gentleman's Magazine*, 39, 1767, pp. 20, 44 published a much shorter report.

[2] The classic exposition of the thesis of the ideological function of eighteenth-century English penal law is Douglas Hay, 'Property, Authority and the Criminal Law', in *Albion's Fatal Tree: Crime and Society in Eighteenth-Century England*, ed. Douglas

reveals distinctions, which seem to show, if not a 'class' difference, then at least a generally discerned distinction in the manner of the criminals' treatment. All four condemned men were hanged for 'the usual time', but their bodies were treated differently. Those of Orton and Thornhill were taken 'in hearses', Johnston's corpse was put into a coffin, while the body of the other seaman was taken by sailors, who attended the execution. These distinctions and their legal, customary and cultural implications will form the subject of the remarks below.

Research on early modern 'theatres of death', public executions, their regulation in law and their cultural and social functions has a long tradition and significant achievements. Public executions have become a separate subject for analysis on the margins of the history of crime, crossing into research on the evolution of penal law, socially established custom, plebeian mores, and the history of psychology and the emotions. Historians are no longer interested only in the processes by which various categories of penal law were created, their practical application and the statistics of early modern criminality. On the one hand we seek — like Pieter Spierenburg — explanations of the social roots of individual examples (in the case of the study cited here — love as the motive for the crime), which illuminate various cultures of human relationships. We seek to show the 'deep context' of collective obsessions which led — as described for colonial New York by Mark Fearnow — to 'the hysteria of killing', the hanging of all those who appeared to threaten the stability of the 'smalltown' community (New York had up to 10,000 inhabitants in the first half of the eighteenth century), or else — as Florike Egmond has shown for the Netherlands — to reconstruct the means of coexistence and activity of the second, criminal and well organized alternative society.[3] The English case is often used to good effect, partly because of the rich and well-ordered sources, but also because of the conviction, repeated by many historians, that the rules of the penal system were applied with exceptional severity.[4] It is worth recalling that the father of modern research on the history of En-

Hay et al., London, 1975, pp. 17–63. In the same tradition is the 'panoramic' analysis of the 'plebeian victims' of the penal system by Peter Linebaugh, *The London Hanged: Crime and Civil Society in the Eighteenth Century*, London, 1991.

[3] Peter Spierenburg, *Written in Blood: Fatal Attraction in Enlightenment Amsterdam*, Columbus, OH, 2004; Florike Egmond, *Underworlds. Organized Crime in the Netherlands, 1650–1800*, Cambridge, MA, 1993; Mark Fearnow, 'Theatre for an Angry God. Public Burnings and Hangings in Colonial New York, 1741', *The Drama Review*, 40, 1996, 2, pp. 15–36.

[4] The registers of thousands of criminal trials at the Old Bailey are available online as part of a project led by Professor Tim Hitchcock of the University of Hertfordshire: ⟨http://www.oldbaileyonline.org⟩.

glish penal law was a Pole, (Sir) Leon Radzinowicz, who arrived in Great Britain in 1938 with a recommendation from the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Poland, and who during his career laid the foundations for the achievements of the Anglo-Saxon historiography on the subject.[5] Radzinowicz's first studies concentrated on the English Bloody Code, a collection of statutes with Elizabethan roots, which categorized even minor infractions (and there were almost two hundred categories), especially against property, as capital offences. The eighteenth century has been considered the apogee of penalization understood and applied in this way.

The result of Radzinowicz's research was the debate begun in the 1970s by Douglas Hay and John Langbein about the social conditions of the functioning of the law. It yielded — thanks to the insights of Michel Foucault and the research of Peter Linebaugh, John Beattie, Simon Devereaux and others — detailed findings, which confirm that as early as the start of the eighteenth century, and certainly from its middle decades, a discussion took place in England regarding the 'strategy of punishment'. The search for a balance between capital punishment and transportation and other milder instruments brought about the gradual questioning of the didactic effectiveness of hanging. Among the contributing factors were the knowledge of Cesare Beccaria's treatise *Dei delitti e delle penne* (1764) which was swiftly translated into English (1767), the observations made by English jurists led by Sir William Blackstone and the general questioning of the 'efficiency' of the means of detecting crimes and the effectiveness of passing death sentences for common offences.[6] As early as 1725 the Dutch doctor Bernard Mandeville, naturalized in England, published his treatise *An Inquiry into the Causes of the Frequent Executions at Tyburn*, in which he strongly criticized the 'theatre' of hanging

[5] Leon Radzinowicz, *A History of English Criminal Law and its Administration from 1750*, 5 vols, London, 1948–86, vol. 1: *The Movement for Reform 1750–1833*. The evolution of Anglo-Saxon historiography in the last century is reviewed by Bruce P. Smith, 'English Criminal Justice Administration, 1650–1850: A Historiographic Essay', *Law and History Review*, 25, 2007, 3, pp. 593–634.

[6] The debate was first framed by Douglas Hay, 'Property, Authority and the Criminal Law' (n. 2), and John H. Langbein, 'Albion's Fatal Flaws', *P&P*, 98, 1983, pp. 96–120. This phase of research is reviewed by Joanna Innes and John Styles, 'The Crime Wave: Recent Writing on Crime and Criminal Justice in Eighteenth-Century England', *Journal of British Studies*, 25, 1986, 4, pp. 380–435. See John M. Beattie, *Crime and the Courts in England, 1660–1800*, Princeton, NJ, 1986; idem, *Policing and Punishment in London, 1660–1750: Urban Crime and the Limits of Terror*, Oxford, 2001; Simon Devereaux, 'The Making of the Penitentiary Act, 1775–1779', *HJ*, 42, 1999, 2, pp. 405–33; Anthony J. Draper, 'Cesare Beccaria's Influence on English Discussion of Punishment, 1764–1789', *History of European Ideas*, 26, 2000, 3–4, pp. 177–99. I have used the English edition of Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, London, 1977.

and argued that public executions encouraged excesses, instead of deterring other criminals. A more penetrative analysis of the 'strategy of punishment' was carried out by Henry Fielding, writer and magistrate, whose work *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Late Increase of Robbers*, written in 1751 in response to a wave of violence, armed robberies and burglaries that had afflicted London, proposed to confine condemned men in gaols and to 'privatize' the carrying out of the death penalty. Fielding drew particular attention to the inadequate system of detecting crimes, the relegation of victims to the role of silent witnesses and the general powerlessness of the judicial system in the great metropolis, whose streets teemed not only with people who readily escalated verbal abuse into physical violence, but also with far more threatening malefactors and criminals.[7] Statistics from magistrates' courts that dealt with the most common offences — between neighbours — show that in the period 1730–60 as many as 53 per cent of cases concerned the threat of violence.[8] Although minor — as opposed to capital — offences also show a pattern of growth, the death sentence — by hanging — remained the basic means of deterrence throughout the eighteenth century and for obvious reasons attracted the attention of lawyers, commentators and the authors of narrative sources. It can be ar-

[7] The significance of the 'half-private' custody for suspects run by the brothers Fielding on Bow Street for the evolution of court procedures has been analysed by John M. Beattie, 'Sir John Fielding and Public Justice: The Bow Street Magistrates' Court, 1754–1780', *Law and History Review*, 25, 2007, 1, pp. 61–100.

[8] The following press report can be considered typical: 'Among the many desperate and cruel robberies that were committed about this time three persons returning to Town from Islington about 7 in the evening on Sunday, Feb. 26 [1749 — P. T. D.] were attack'd in Frog-Fields near that place by 3 fellows, who came from behind the barn, and Mr. John Scot foreman to a taylor in Old-Broad street, making some resistance, one of the rogues cut him down the back part of the head with a hanger. They then made their escapes, leaving his two companions whom they had robb'd to take care of him. He was carried to the Red-Lion at Islington, where he languished for 2 or 3 days, and then expired', *London Magazine*, 18, 1749, p. 141. On the basis of jokes and anecdotes Simon Dickie ('Hilarity and Pitilessness in the Mid-Eighteenth Century: English Jestbook Humor', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 37, 2003, 1, pp. 1–22) sketched the cultural field of plebeian verbal aggression. Cf. Robert B. Shoemaker, 'The Decline of Public Insult in London 1660–1800', *P&P*, 169, 2000, p. 117; Philip Smith, 'Executing Executions: Aesthetics, Identity, and the Problematic Narratives of Capital Punishment Ritual', *Theory and Society*, 25, 1996, 2, pp. 248 ff.; Simon Devereaux, 'Recasting the Theatre of Execution: The Abolition of the Tyburn Ritual', *P&P*, 202, 2009, pp. 146 f.; Thomas W. Laqueur, 'Crowds, Carnival and the State in English Executions, 1604–1868', in *The First Modern Society: Essays in English History in Honour of Lawrence Stone*, ed. A. L. Beier, David Cannadine and James M. Rosenheim, Cambridge, 1989, pp. 305–55. The Parisian space of urban criminality has been discussed by Arlette Farge and André Zysberg, 'Les Théâtres de la violence à Paris au XVIII[e] siècle', *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales*, 34, 1979, 5, pp. 984–1015.

gued, that they had good reason to do so: successive 'crimewaves' meant that the spectacle of public hanging was well known to Londoners. In the years 1770–75 an average of 37 people were hanged annually. According to Simon Devereaux, after 1780 the number of executions rose first by 30 per cent, and then by 70 per cent.[9] We should not, however, accept the stereotype of an omnipresent and universally applied death penalty. The analysis of sentencing shows that courts used the death penalty after due consideration. Even in cases of statutory capital offences (murder, armed robbery and burglary) the death sentence was sometimes commuted to a lesser punishment. According to contemporary data, collected by the Lord Mayor of London, Theodore Janssen, in 1749–71 1,121 criminals held in Newgate were condemned to death: 443 of them avoided execution (401 of them were sentenced instead to transportation). A substantial number of those criminals whose deeds had led them on a 'statutory' basis to the scaffold had their lives spared. For example, of 81 convicted murderers 72 were hanged. Among 362 condemned highwaymen, the death sentence was carried out in 251 cases, while of 208 burglars 118 were hanged, and 27 pickpockets out of a total of 80 were hanged. As Langbein has established using a sample of 203 cases in the Old Bailey, as many as 83 were acquitted by juries. The London criminal court held eight sessions a year, during which it 'cleansed the gaol': it thus sentenced all those suspects held in Newgate, who had been arrested in London and the neighbouring county of Middlesex. The procedure was swift, with individual cases rarely detaining the judges for more than an hour. After the passing of the Murder Act in 1752, executions were carried out no later than two days after the sentence had been passed. The proceedings and sentence were published in the sessions papers, and so became available for all those interested, especially for the editors of newspapers. They were also the documentary basis for petitions for clemency.[10]

Until 1783, executions were carried out at Tyburn crossroads (now in the vicinity of Marble Arch), which lay beyond the bounds of the city in the parish of St Mary 'by the bourne' (that is, the Tyburn stream, which now

[9] Simon Devereaux, 'Imposing the Royal Pardon: Execution, Transportation, and Convict Resistance in London, 1789', *Law and History Review*, 25, 2007, 1, p. 120.

[10] Idem, 'The City and the Sessions Paper: "Public Justice" in London, 1770–1800', *Journal of British Studies*, 35, 1996, 4, pp. 466–503; idem, 'Imposing the Royal Pardon', pp. 101–38; Langbein, Albion's Fatal Flaws' (n. 6), pp. 106, 110. The general rise in common offences has been analysed by Peter King, 'Punishing Assault: The Transformation of Attitudes in the English Courts', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 27, 1996, 1, pp. 43–74.

runs beneath Marylebone), where in 1571 a gallows was erected, called the 'three-legged stool', on which a dozen or more convicts could be hanged at once. In 1759 the original 'hanging tree' was replaced by a new instrument: a movable gallows. In the eighteenth century the city absorbed the locality and the gallows — along with stands for spectators — which were now in a built-up area, close to Oxford Street, the site of residences and workshops. After two centuries of regularly conducted executions the best known London 'theatre of death', to use the term borrowed from Andrea McKenzie with regard to the eighteenth-century spectacle of hanging, possessed a well established place in the urban space and imagination. James A. Sharpe, whose analysis of the seventeenth--century location of public executions in London is still a work of fundamental importance, drew attention to the popularity of chapbooks, in which models of 'good deaths' were described, and emphasized the didactic dimension of the punishment. Sharpe underlined the religious and 'state' conformism which attended the convicts in the last moments of their lives; they were expected to make a public act of remorse and to appeal to the spectators not to follow their sinful path.[11] He also suggested that at the beginning of the eighteenth century, the hallowed tradition of the presence of clergymen during executions no longer produced the expected speech from the convict which would appropriately move the spectators. Sharpe associated this with the decline of the eschatological dimension of death and its replacement with the secular priority of completing a court procedure. Moreover, Sharpe highlighted the persistence of the early modern debate over the 'deterrent' and 'educational' values of the death penalty. He noted evidence of its becoming ordinary — as in the popular saying noted in 1725, that 'there is nothing in being hang'd, but a wry neck, and a wet pair of breeches' — but he also

[11] J. A. Sharpe, '"Last Dying Speeches": Religion, Ideology and Public Execution in Seventeenth-Century England', *P&P*, 107, 1985, pp. 144–167; Steven Wilf, 'Imagining Justice: Aesthetics and Public Executions in Late Eighteenth-Century England', *Yale Journal of Law and the Humanities*, 5, 1993, pp. 51–78; Andrea McKenzie, 'Martyrs of Low Life? Dying "Game" in Augustan England', *Journal of British Studies*, 42, 2003, 2, pp. 167–205; eadem, *Tyburn's Martyrs: Execution in England, 1675–1775*, London, 2007; Peter Linebaugh, 'The Ordinary of Newgate and His Account', in *Crime in England, 1550–1800*, ed. J. S. Cockburn, Princeton, NJ, 1977, pp. 246–68. Pieter Spierenburg, *The Spectacle of Suffering: Executions and the Evolution of Repression. From a Preindustrial Metropolis to the European Experiences*, Cambridge, 1984; Frances E. Dolan, '"Gentlemen, I Have One Thing More to Say": Women on Scaffolds in England, 1563–1680', *Modern Philology*, 92, 1994, 2, pp. 157–78; Louis Masur, *Rites of Execution*, Oxford, 1989; Devereaux, 'Recasting the Theatre of Execution' (n. 8), pp. 127–74.

stated that the tradition of 'speeches from the scaffold' kept its own dynamics and remained lively.[12]

Below I shall use several press reports of executions at Tyburn which were placed in London monthlies — in media which in the eighteenth century, following the daily newspapers, replaced the earlier chapbooks and in a hitherto unknown way (qualitatively and quantitatively) accumulated, related and ordered information about many aspects of daily life in the city. They devoted much space to criminals, their trials and their executions. Newspapers used their own reporters' accounts as well as the easily available session papers published at the conclusion of each of the eight monthly sessions of the London criminal court (in the second half of the eighteenth century 320 copies of each session's paper were published at the city's expense), providing a wealth of detail for each of the cases heard.[13] I shall try to draw attention to distinctions and differences appearing in the models of the 'theatricization of public dying', which testify that in the city space of eighteenth-century London the spectacle of death gradually saw changes that took place in the social fabric of the city — more quickly than at Tyburn.

The custom of 'speeches from the scaffold' continued in the eighteenth century, although the London press, generally because of the surfeit of information and the limited space in its columns, did not usually report them at length. They were however available as an element of the reports of court proceedings, whose didactic role was recognized in 1734 by the writer Samuel Richardson: 'Let the Session-Paper and the Dying-Speaches of unhappy Criminals [...] inform the inconsiderate Youth [...] how naturally, as it were Step by Step, Swearing, Cursing, Profaneness, Drunkenness, Whor[e]dom, Theft, Robbery, Murder and the Gallows, succeed one another'.[14] The public show of remorse remained

[12] Sharpe, '"Last Dying Speeches"', pp. 165–67. The ethical and didactic message of eighteenth-century 'court sermons', which were usually preached at the beginning of assizes have been analysed by Randall McGowen, '"He Beareth Not the Sword in Vain": Religion and the Criminal Law in Eighteenth-Century England', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 21, 1987–88, 2, pp. 192–211, emphasizing the pressure from clergymen for the carrying out of severe sentences.

[13] On the role of the press in raising criminal themes see Jeremy Black, *The English Press in the Eighteenth Century*, London, pp. 99–108; James Oldham, 'Law Reporting in the London Newspapers, 1756–1786', *American Journal of Legal History*, 31, 1987, 3, pp. 177–206; John Styles, 'Sir John Fielding and the Problem of Criminal Investigation in Eighteenth-Century England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th Series, 33, 1983, pp. 135 ff.; Beattie, 'Sir John Fielding' (n. 7), pp. 69 f., 85 f.

[14] Quoted after Devereaux, 'The City' (n. 10), p. 496. Cf. Ian Bell, *Literature and Crime in Augustan England*, London, 1994, pp. 72–74.

a constant element of the landscape of the scaffold at London's edge, although both the press 'carrier', through which didactic messages were spread, and the way in which those messages were reported to London readers, changed as a result of an inundation of various, not only criminal news. In the eighteenth century the newspapers were a basic source of information about the punishments administered, with other media functioning alongside: in an engraving by William Hogarth from 1747, titled *The Idle 'Prentice Executed at Tyburn*, the artist depicted a cart with a coffin and a clergyman, while at the foot of the scaffold was a seated woman, who while holding a child in one hand, was selling with the other the previously printed 'last speech' of the condemned man.[15]

From the description of the execution, which took place on 25 February 1754 in Ilchester, the reader learned that 'the noted John Poulter, alias Baxter,who had made his escape out of gaol and was soon retaken,was executed at Ilvechester, behaving very penitently, and with decent resolution. As soon as he arrived at the gallows he stood up in the cart three times, declaring aloud, that the report of the gaoler's having contrived to let him escape was without any foundation. He then addressed himself to the people, desiring them to take warning by his unhappy end, and avoid bad company; acknowledging that he deserved to suffer death, but that most of his accomplices did more so.' Summaries of the descriptions of executions — and court procedures — carried out by newspapers replicated the basic structure of the official reports and conveyed a shortened version of the last words pronounced by the condemned men. In the case of Poulter we may obviously wonder which fragments of the speech were 'edited' or even previously agreed with him. From the press report it can be concluded that it served several ends simultaneously: it pronounced a standard formula of remorse, it absolved the gaoler (threatened with the noose) from guilt and pointed to the still greater guilt of his accomplices, who remained a source of danger to those assembled.[16]

Some press reports can be found, which appear to be only pale and distorted reflections of the earlier (one would like to say 'baroque') mo-

[15] The appetite for 'scaffold literature' continued to be hearty: in 1768 a four-volume book was published under the significant title *The Tyburn Chronicle; or Villainy Display'd in All Its Branches*, which 'to support virtue and religion' related the life-stories of those hanged; see Devereaux, 'The City', p. 497. This type of literature, created, among others, by a prison chaplain, disappears about 1770. Cf. McKenzie, 'Martyrs', pp. 170 ff. On Hogarth's engraving see Barbara Jaffe, 'William Hogarth and Eighteenth Century English Law Relating to Capital Punishment', *Law and Literature*, 15, 2003, 2, p. 268 and il. 1; cf. a more cautious assessment by Simon Devereaux, 'Recasting the Theatre of Execution', p. 142.

[16] *London Magazine*, 23, 1754, p. 138.

tif of the 'glorious conversion' of the sinner in the face of death. The cobbler John Williamson, a 'a tall man about forty-six years of age', sentenced for starving his wife to death, was taken to Chiswell Street in Moorfields. A different place from the usual Tyburn was chosen as his place of execution, because the didactic aim was to hang him in the district where he had lived and was known. Two Anglican clergymen accompanied him, along with a 'a Methodist teacher', who prayed for him 'for a full hour'. Then, 'it was with much difficulty that the clergymen could prevail upon him to acknowledge his crime, but at last, just before the cart drew off one of the clergymen informed the people that he had confessed to murder; and further that his disorderly life had been a principal means of bringing him into that unfortunate situation, and hoped the people would pray for his soul.' The newspaper reported — regrettably without explaining the reason — that the execution was witnessed by 10,000 people, 'a great number of whom were women'.[17]

English court documents and their public circulation generated by printed pamphlets summarizing individual cases and press reports of the outcome of sessions at the Old Bailey — the main London institution dealing with sentences for criminal offences — are a unique resource, containing thousands of reports about who was sentenced and for what crimes. Historians studying the English (or British) judicial system and its social and cultural ramifications have made extensive use of this collection, including attempts at statistical analysis, despite the known methodological limitations of such material.

The reading of hundreds of individual, short press reports about crimes committed reveals an extraordinary panorama of urban criminality in the largest metropolis of eighteenth-century Europe. In January 1751 the death sentence was passed on, among others, a professional stage-boxer, James Field, who besides plying his own pugilistic trade robbed a passer-by of his spectacles, a tobacco case, and thirteen shillings. William Vincent relieved another of silver trouser-buckles and

[17] *London Magazine*, 36, 1767, p. 41. Fortunately the rival monthly *Gentleman's Magazine* used the court proceedings more exactly, and informed its readers that the cobbler had murdered his wife with premeditation, because his wife 'the poor creature was a kind of idiot, who having a sum on money left for her maintenance Williamson to possess himself of the money found means to marry her'. An account followed of the sufferings of the victim and the note that the assembled crowd, consisting of persons who knew him and his neighbours, wanted to tear him to pieces, so the condemned man himself asked the executioner to carry out the sentence quickly. *Gentleman's Magazine*, 39, 1767, p. 44. Crimes in the category of 'domestic cruelty' are discussed by Margaret Hunt, 'Wife-Beating, Domesticity and Woman's Independence in Eighteenth-Century London', *Gender and History*, 4, 1992, pp. 10–35.

was similarly sentenced to death. Richard Parsons, a repeat-offender previously sentenced to transportation, had returned to England despite the fact that another brush with the law would take him to the gallows. The thirteen persons sentenced by the court to death in that session had mostly committed street robbery, burglary or theft involving tablewares, watches, money, hats and wigs. Without losing sight of death sentences — and executions — it should be emphasized that the evolution of the British judicial system in the eighteenth century shows a consistent tendency towards the reduction of such sentences and their replacement by transportation — which was considered as a substitute for more severe penalties — and lesser punishments. In the cited January session of the Old Bailey, besides the thirteen death sentences there were also 35 sentences of transportation to the colonies and two cases of branding with a hot iron. This last category, along with the stocks or pillory, belonged to the typical means of denoting 'punishments of public shame', deeply rooted and traditional forms of infamy, whose social presence and longevity has been brilliantly explored by Natalie Zemon Davis.[18] Transportation to America — for seven or fourteen years or for life — was regarded as a socially beneficial punishment, and was used as a substitute for the death sentence. In cases where the convict returned from banishment before serving his sentence, he was considered a re-offender and punished with the noose.[19] Anglo-Saxon historiography has conducted a thorough analysis of the extent and the social and economic significance of sentences of transportation. For most of the eighteenth century they dealt with the banishment to America. Between 1718 and 1775 this was the destination for some 50,000 convicts, mostly petty thieves, vagrants and prostitutes, who became 'white slaves' and supplied the colonial labour market.[20]

[18] On 'Friday, January 18 [1745] David Manning and John Davis were sentenced to stand the pillory and to be imprisoned, the former for six, the latter for three months for sodomitical practices', *London Magazine*, 14, 1745, p. 47. Cf. Randolph Trumbach, 'Sex, Gender, and Sexual Identity in Modern Culture: Male Sodomy and Female Prostitution in Enlightenment London', *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 2, 1991, pp. 186–203. On the 'rituals of shame' cf. Natalie Zemon Davis, *Society and Culture in Early Modern France*, Stanford, CA, 1975, pp. 106–81; William Beik, 'The Violence of the French Crowd from Charivari to Revolution', *P&P*, 197, 2007, pp. 75–110.

[19] For example: the Jew Jakub Cardoso, condemned to transportation, broke out of Newgate Gaol, and on being caught was sentenced to death; on Richard Parsons, sentenced to death for returning before serving his time, see the *London Magazine*, 12, 1743, p. 619; ibid., 20, 1751, p. 43. Cf. 'John Payan otherwise Pidgeon [condemned to death — P. T. D.] for privately stealing a Watch, who seem'd very much concern'd and begg'd the favour of the Court of Transportation for Life, tho' a reputed pickpocket for about 20 years', ibid., 15, 1746, p. 476.

[20] *London Magazine*, 20, 1751, p. 43. On transportations to America see: Kenneth

Even if every one of those condemned to death had actually died in that way, the procedure and scenography of hanging were differentiated in such a way so that the assembled mob had the basic information about the circumstances and reasons for the execution. On Monday 14 March 1737, an oar and naval signs were carried before two carts taking convicts to their place of execution: emblems testifying that the condemned men belonged to the category called 'pirates', and that the sentences had been passed by the Court of Admiralty, an institution that dealt with crimes committed at sea and on board British ships. The procedures and customs of the Court of Admiralty require further historical investigation, but it is known that the court met in the same building as the municipal court that heard criminal cases. Its sessions were however less frequent. The judges, and subsequently the convicts were marked by the emblem of the institution: the oar (in the case of the judges, a silver oar) and its cases essentially concerned crimes committed 'on the high seas'. It is difficult to recognize the four convicts of March 1737 as pirates, although in the public imagination they may have been brethren to the members of the famous fraternity of the West Indies. As Marcus Rediker has shown, the colourful figures of 'real' — Caribbean — pirates disappeared in the first decades of the eighteenth century under pressure from the well-organized military and judicial machinery of the state.[21] Their ethos remained, however, notably their 'romantic' vision of a maritime proto--democracy of rebels, sold in cheap pamphlets as a literary construction originating in the picaresque novel. The convicted quartet had worked

Morgan, 'The Organization of the Convict Trade to Maryland: Stevenson, Randolph & Cheston, 1768–1775', *William & Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Series, 42, 1985, 2, pp. 201–27; A. Roger Ekirch, 'Bound for America: A Profile of British Convicts Transported to the Colonies, 1718–1775', *William & Mary Quarterly*, 3rd Series, 42, 1985, 2, pp. 184–200; idem, *Bound for America: The Transportation of British Convicts to the Colonies, 1718–1775*, Oxford, 1987; Aaron S. Fogelman, 'From Slaves, Convicts, and Servants to Free Passengers: The Transformation of Immigration in the Era of the American Revolution', *Journal of American History*, 85, 1998, 1, pp. 43–76; Farley Grubb, 'The Transatlantic Market for British Convict Labor', *Journal of Economic History*, 60, 2000, 1, pp. 94–122; idem, 'The Market Evaluation of Criminality: Evidence from the Auction of British Convict Labor in America, 1767–1775', *American Economic Review*, 91, 2001, 1, pp. 295–304; Gwenda Morgan and Peter Rushton, *Eighteenth-Century Criminal Transportation: The Formation of the Criminal Atlantic*, New York, 2004; Devereaux, 'Imposing the Royal Pardon' (n. 9), pp. 101–38.

[21] Marcus Rediker, *Between the Devil and the Deep Blue Sea: Merchant Seamen, Pirates, and the Anglo-American Maritime World, 1700–1750*, Cambridge, 1987; idem, *Villains of All Nations: Atlantic Pirates in the Golden Age*, Boston, MA, 2004. Cf. the interesting study of piracy in the Indian Ocean: Patricia Risso, 'Cross-Cultural Perceptions of Piracy: Maritime Violence in the Western Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf Region during a Long Eighteenth Century', *Journal of World History*, 12, 2001, 2, pp. 293–319.

on the seas, on British merchant ships, but instead of 'piratical' deeds they had committed common crimes — in European waters. We discover that two of them — mate Williams and seaman Johnston — had murdered the master of the brigantine *Dove* with knives, when the ship was moored in Livorno. Unluckily for them, the captain's servant, a witness to the murder, jumped overboard and brought help from other English ships. Another of the 'pirates', mate Coyle, turned out to be the leader and instigator of a mutiny in August 1735 off the Turkish coast on board the pinnace *St John*. The victim was the ship's captain who, despite pleas for mercy had his head bludgeoned, and his corpse thrown into the sea. The arm of British maritime law was long, however, and the criminal was finally caught — in Tunis — and brought to London. The press report, which faithfully gave the details of the trial, noted that the condemned men were 'hanged in chains' as a sign of their criminal past and particularly anti-social behaviour. In other cases judged by the Admiralty Court we learn that desertion, all kinds of mutiny and insubordination, shooting a customs official and burglary with the aim of landing goods without paying duties, and an attempt to burn a ship in order to obtain an insurance payout were all considered 'piracy'. 'Pirates' were not hanged together with other criminals close to the city centre at Tyburn. Their carts went in procession towards the Thames and their execution took place on the riverside, at the place known as 'Execution Dock'.[22]

The well-known work of Eric J. Hobsbawm on the social roots of banditry suffices to remind us that in parallel to the image of the pirate — godless, pugnacious, but close to 'simple people' — functioned the image of his equivalent on land — the highwayman, who robs travellers and seizes private and public property alike.[23] The richness of this literary motif, known in its modern version from the foothills of the Tatra mountains (in the early eighteenth century) to the American prairies (in the nineteenth century) hardly needs recalling, although, as Lincoln Faller has stated, the abundance of this kind of criminal biography owes most to the English market for this type of literature. Gillian Spriggs, the author of a monograph on English banditry, underlines its own kind of natural fascination with a persona of an armed robber. The transformations of this motif are also important. Juraj Janosik, a Slovak bandit from the Trenčin district, hanged on 17 March 1718 (for robberies, but not for murder) had a second life a century after his execution as a romantic defender of the

[22] *London Magazine*, 6, 1737, pp. 163–64; ibid., 12, 1742, p. 619; ibid., 23, 1754, p. 91; Devereaux, 'Recasting the Theatre of Execution', p. 139.

[23] Eric J. Hobsbawm, *Bandits*, New York, 1969.

Slovaks from feudal oppression, whereas his English contemporary Dick Turpin, the leader of a band of highwaymen and the hero of novellas, did not hesitate to use firearms — with fatal results.[24] Still more important, however (returning to the moment when the criminals receive their just penalties) is that the narratives of highwaymen's deaths seem often to be written in a different style to that in which the hanging of other convicts is related. Instead of showing remorse and making elevating speeches, Turpin and many of his imitators, such as 'Gentleman Jack' Sheppard, hanged on 16 November 1724, or the band-leader Jonathan Wild, executed a year later, displayed to the crowd an arrogant and insolent attitude at the hour of their deaths. They mocked the judicial process by exchanging smiles with women on their way to the scaffold and spending the last night of their lives (in gaol) drinking and playing cards, thus publicly ridiculing the apparently obligatory paradigm of remorse.[25]

Every attempt to describe the 'hanging' rhythm of urban culture in the categories of didactic theatre should take into account the intended scenario leading from proven guilt and the sentence to the public show of remorse. However, such efforts should also incorporate individual reactions and those acted out according to another code — resistance or submission — by the most important participants in the drama. 'Yesterday morning', the *Universal Magazine* informed its readers on 14 February 1765,

> Matthew James, for forgery, John Ward, for robbery in Moorfields, John Routon, for house-breaking in Chick-lane, and Edward Williams for robbing the house of Right Hon. Earl Verney of plate, etc. were, pursuant to their sentences, executed at Tyburn. Williams, regardless of the numerous spectators, prayed in the most fervent manner from Newgate to the place

[24] The fortunes of Turpin's band are reconstructed by Derek Barlow, *Dick Turpin and the Gregory Gang*, London and Chichester, 1973. The transformation of the Janosik legend (and the earlier scholarly literature) is discussed by Martin Votruba, 'Hang Him High: The Elevation of Janosik to an Ethnic Icon', *Slavic Review*, 65, 2006, 1, pp. 24–44. Migrations of legends and explosions of 'bandit literature' are analysed by Lincoln B. Faller, 'Criminal Opportunities in the Eighteenth Century: The "Ready--Made" Contexts of the Popular Literature of Crime', *Comparative Literature Studies*, 24, 1987, 2, pp. 120–45; idem, *Turned to Account: The Forms and Functions of Criminal Biography in Late Seventeenth-and Early Eighteenth-Century England*, New York, 1987. See Michael Harris, 'Trials and Criminal Biographies: A Case Study in Distribution', in *Sale and Distribution of Books from 1700*, ed. Robin Myers and Michael Harris, Oxford, 1982, pp. 1–36; Gillian Spriggs, *Outlaws and Highwayman: The Cult of the Robber in England from the Middle Ages to the Nineteenth Century*, London, 2001, p. 12 ('national worship').

[25] ⟨http://www.stand-and-deliver.org.uk/highwaymen⟩ [accessed 17 May 2012]. Cf. McKenzie, 'Martyrs', pp. 183 ff.; P. Smith, 'Executing Executions', pp. 245 ff.

> of execution, Ward dying a Papist, turned his back upon the minister, and Routon near St. Giles's-pound pulled off his shoes and threw them among the crowd.[26]

Williams conformed to the minimum expected of him by 'cultural correctness', Ward showed himself a heretic, considered a foreign enemy by the crowd (he was probably Irish), while Routon — judging by the kind of offence he had committed, a common London criminal — made a demonstrative gesture challenging the assembled spectators: a sign of despair and impotent rage.

Let us return to the last journey of Samuel Orton. Was the use of a closed coach instead of an open cart (only after 1763 were the carts marked in black cloth) a sign of particular distinction for this convict? What had he done to deserve better treatment than hundreds of others, whom the assembled public could watch in a procession of several hours from Newgate to the capital's gallows? The press report records that 'when they came to the place of execution they behaved devoutly and penitently. Mr. Orton took leave of some friends with great composure, but Thornhill, before the cart drew away [which meant hanging — P. T. D.] put up his cap five times seeming very unwilling to leave this world'. The very fact that Orton was accompanied by friends calls for reflection. Most reports of Tyburn hangings note only the main protagonists, sometimes adding clergymen as well, or (usually nameless) officials and law-enforcers, whose task was to ensure that the solemnity of the execution was not disturbed by the excesses of the crowd.[27] London's plebeian convicts rarely had their friends described. More usually, mention is made of companions, accomplices or other members of

[26] *Universal Magazine*, 36, 1765, p. 108.

[27] Surprisingly little is known about London's executioners. They were paid by the City (at the beginning of the eighteenth century with an annual salary of forty pounds). They had additional income from bribes, for example for a swift, so-called painless hanging, from fees from families for taking the body to the cemetery or from doctors, for taking it to the dissecting room. It appears that they were often criminals, and that many continued to come into conflict with the law. The executioner John Price (who carried out the function from 1714), a former sailor, was a chronically indebted drunkard (he was incarcerated in a debtors' prison). While drunk he murdered a street apple-seller and was hanged in 1718. His successor William Marvel was transported in 1719 for the theft of ten silk handkerchiefs, while Thomas Thurlis (executioner in the years 1752–71, which means that he hanged Orton) was arrested in 1763 for the theft of coal from his neighbour's cellar (he told the court that it was because of his poverty). See Gerald D. Robin, 'The Executioner: His Place in English Society', *British Journal of Sociology*, 15, 1964, 3, p. 237.

the band, if the criminal belonged to one.[28] Orton behaved differently to Thornhill — he was serious and dignified. He was much older than his three fellows in misery. The statistics of convicts transported to America show that crimes were mostly committed by young unemployed or unqualified men (among the transportees almost 40 per cent were less than 24 years old).[29]

Orton was someone else entirely — a businessman and the father of a family. Taking into account his controlled behaviour it would be natural to expect that, reconciled to his fate, he would make an exemplary speech from the scaffold, thus writing his death into the wider and still lively context of ethically orientated propaganda. He chose, however, a different means of engaging with public opinion: instead of speaking to the crowd gathered below the gallows, several days before his execution, thanks to the assistance of a clergyman who offered him his spiritual support in gaol, he had printed in the London press an open letter, in which he detailed the reasons and circumstances which had led to his imprisonment and expected execution at Tyburn. A pamphlet was published in Hood's printing house, which reported the trial and sentence in detail. The very fact that the accused had reached for his pen and used the possibility of addressing a much wider audience than that which watched public executions shows the different cultural and social sensitivities to which he appealed. Was this proof of the 'birth of silence', the process which Peter Burke suggests took place in Europe from the middle of the seventeenth century and signified the subordination of human behaviour — including that expressed verbally — to

[28] Cf. this report: 'Several constables of St. Andrew's Holbourne attended by a large party of the foot-guards went with a search warrant to a noted publick-house on Saffron Hill in order to detect a large gang of street-robbers, pickpockets, loose women etc. and having surrounded it both before and behind, they secured ten men and two women, and carried them before justice Hole who, after a long examination committed them to Clarkenwell Bridewell. This gang was said to consist of about 50, tho' no more happened to be in the house, when officers came. One of them attempted to make his escape from the house-top, but a soldier firing at him, he surrendered', *London Magazine*, 18, 1749, p. 141. London was reputed in the eighteenth century to be the worst policed city in Europe, being (unlike Paris) without a professional police force. The 'para-police' organizations, such as citizen-night watches (in 152 parishes of the city), active before the 1829 reform are described by Elaine A. Reynolds, *Before the Bobbies: The Night Watch and Police Reform in Metropolitan London, 1720–1830*, Stanford, CA, 1998. Cf. the exemplary study of organized crime by Florike Egmond, 'Crime in Context: Jewish Involvement in Organized Crime in the Dutch Republic', *Jewish History*, 4, 1989, 1, pp. 75–100. On the use of hoods (so that the spectators would not see the face during the death agony lasting several minutes) see Devereaux, 'Recasting the Theatre of Execution', p. 157.

[29] Ekirch, *Bound for America* (n. 20), p. 195.

the newly promoted requirements of correctness and discipline in human relationships?[30]

Orton's open letter appealed to criteria and categories belonging to a different economic dimension and different set of human relations to those which we can read from notes of the style, place and type of activity of most convicts. Orton belonged to a different world than Joseph Leath, who was hanged for theft commited in a stagecoach, or John Gerrard, a pickpocket who, defying the principle that when it is crowded, it is easy, went to Tyburn because he deftly, but inefficiently extracted an embroidered handkerchief from a spectator's pocket at Drury Lane Theatre, or Thomas Hill, who sold false playing cards. Orton did not belong to the street vagabonds who stole items that easily fell into the hands of thieves and burglars — watches, purses, tableware, bed linen, clothes — and which convince contemporary researchers of the inventory of the 'material culture' of eighteenth-century London that an unbroken process of enrichment was taking place among even the lower strata of urban society.[31] The anonymous clergyman who looked after Orton in gaol left a most flattering image of the condemned man, which was also published in a newspaper. We learn that he was the son of cheesemongers from the parish of St Martin in the Fields, had been well schooled in a provincial town, had been an apprentice to a London bookseller, and thanks to the interest of his friends he obtained the post of clerk on a warship in 1749. He had shown himself a man of talent, and a conscientious, sincere and honorable official. When he returned to shore — wrote the clergyman, who discerned in Orton's further decisions the origins of the threat to the career of the young man — 'hoping to increase his fortune by dealing in wine and brandy he laid the foundation of his ruin'.[32] It is immediately obvious that Orton's social context was very different from that inhabited by most of the criminals hanged at Tyburn. Orton belonged to the English 'middle class' which was already clearly visible in the eighteenth century. I use the term while being well aware of the long debate initiated by Edward Patrick Thompson concerning the social categorization of 'pre-industrial' England.[33] Orton occupied within

[30] *A True and Genuine Account of Samuel Orton, who was Executed at Tyburn, on Wednesday January 14, 1767 for a Forgery University Presson the Bank, published by E. Hood*, [London] 1767. See Peter Burke, *The Art Of Conversation*, Cambridge, 1993, p. 140.

[31] *London Magazine*, 12, 1743, p. 619.

[32] Ibid., 36, 1767, pp. 36–37.

[33] See E. P. Thompson, 'Patrician Society, Plebeian Culture', *Journal of Social History*, 7, 1973–74, pp. 382–405; idem, 'Eighteenth-Century English Society: Class Struggle without Class?', *Social History*, 3, 1978, pp. 133–65; and his collected studies: idem, *Customs in Common*, London, 1991. Thompson's historical sociology directly influenced the

that middle class a place which is easiest to describe using the sociologically appropriate adjective 'lower', but because of his roots in that social stratum and his intellectual and professional attributes, his membership of that eighteenth-century sphere of social advancement and success called 'middle class' is not in doubt.

Orton's open letter, written in gaol a week before his execution, was intended to clear his name — that in itself separated him from other convicts, who had neither the appropriate contacts, nor means, nor probably the idea or need, to undertake such an initiative. The defence of one's good name signifies the different attitude of this condemned man compared to the world of London robbers, and also differentiates him from highwaymen, the 'heroes' of popular narratives, who in the face of death behaved in an extrovert manner and appeared to challenge the judicial process until the very end. Orton's death resembled neither that of an insolent highwayman, nor that of a remorseful criminal who had been determined to tell the assembled mob a moral tale that ended with a show of death-agony on the gallows. For Orton the scaffold was neither the only nor the last point of reference of his life and professional connections. The letter, which is too long and detailed to analyse in each of its fragments, is neither a statement of rebellion against the sentence, nor a plea for forgiveness, and it does not contain a clear message linked to the motif of a remorseful criminal, which was so strongly rooted in the 'penitential' tradition of messages which were sent out from the place of public execution.[34] Unlike the examples of self-pity expressed in moral terms, it is a statement of business practice in eighteenth-century London. Instead of pleas for forgiveness for a sinful life, it is a barely concealed accusation against the financial mechanisms which caused this wholesaler of alcohol to find himself in a trap of debt and to decide — although his interpretation of the situation was necessarily different from the one reached by the court — to forge a banker's note. Leaving aside other elements of the argument, one factor is noteworthy. Orton writes of sums — hundreds of pounds — which were beyond the reach of the other convicts with whom he shared the gallows. Those sums reflected an economic sphere to which the other criminals had no access. They contented themselves — like James Field, whose loot, besides the spectacles of the victims, was all of thirteen shillings, or the trio of bandits, who shared three pounds which they had taken by force from a passer-by near Covent

analytical methods of penal law proposed by the 'Warwick school'. See the critical review article by Peter King, 'Edward Thompson's Contribution to Eighteenth-Century Studies: The Patrician-Plebeian Model Re-Examined', *Social History*, 21, 1996, pp. 215–28.

[34] It was published by the *London Magazine*, 36, 1767, pp. 37–38, and the *Gentleman's Magazine*, 39, 1767, p. 20.

Garden — with sums that were attractive and meaningful in the sphere occupied by the 'proletarians', but which in the sphere that contained the transactions carried out by Orton were of no great economic significance.[35]

What was significant, however, was that Orton found himself in a predicament. He held the rapidly expiring bank notes of persons declared bankrupt, whereas his main creditor and — we may assume — business partner, Captain Thomas Bishop had just returned from a sea voyage and expected payment. Orton insisted that he had taken steps to avoid bankruptcy, and knew very well that it would mean not only public disgrace — lists of bankrupts were published daily by the London press — but also relegation from the stratum of respectable businessmen.[36] 'I beg leave to observe — he wrote from gaol — that if I had the least intentions of defrauding the Bank or Captain Bishop, should have gone abroad as soon as I heard of his arrival in Portsmouth [...] I had frequent opportunities of leaving my country but had not the least thought of the dreadful consequences'. Unable to pay his creditor, he feared financial ruin as he was indebted for the substantial sum — for a minor businessman — of two thousand pounds. In desperation — about which he wrote rather vaguely — he forged powers of attorney of Captain Bishop, who had entrusted him with the purchase and sale of his shares and the investment of monetary surpluses acquired during service at sea. By illegally acquiring Bank of England shares, worth five hundred pounds (other sources speak of a sum twice as great), Orton could — perhaps — avert the spectre of bankruptcy, but the unexpected return of the captain had accelerated the sequence of events. Can the forger be believed, when he informed his readers, that he immediately made several attempts to talk to his partner, probably in order to explain the situation and repaying (as he profoundly believed) his substantial liabilities? As he told his London readers, while waiting for another meeting he was arrested.

The frame of Orton's tale is not the problem of guilt or penance, although he seemed to accept the death sentence with a certain resignation, which could signify the influence of conversations with the cler-

[35] *London Magazine*, 20, 1751, pp. 43, 235. The world of London beggars is analysed by Tim Hitchcock, 'Begging on the Streets of Eighteenth-Century London', *Journal of British Studies*, 44, 2005, 3, pp. 478–98. Cf. Pieter Spierenburg, 'Close to the Edge: Criminals and Marginals in Dutch Cities', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 31, 1998, 3, pp. 355–59.

[36] Sheila Marriner, 'English Bankruptcy Records and Statistics before 1850', *Economic History Review*, New Series, 33, 1980, 3, pp. 351–66, draws attention to complex procedures and the difficulties in estimating the number of persons declared bankrupt.

gyman and reconciliation with God.[37] His story is, above all, about the betrayal of trust. Several times Orton emphasized that he had parted with his main creditor, Captain Bishop, 'like a friend' but the fact that it was Bishop who had prompted the tip-off which had resulted in his arrest was a bitter surprise to Orton. As Laurence Fontaine has shown, early modern financial relations, which were based above all on the long-term value of credit and the omnipresent circulation of bankers' drafts, relied on mutual trust among businessmen. Moreover, although the French 'à credit' initially signified — still at the end of the seventeenth century — emotional and aimless deeds, the evolution of the concept and its transformation into the English 'credibility' shows not only the direction of the semantic journey, but also the underlying process of valuing relations, in which even people who did not know each other personally were ready to honour their signature and on that basis guarantee money. On the other hand, the explosion of the market economy and the credit possibilities of 'mercantile capitalism', which were already evident at the beginning of the eighteenth century, facilitated the abuse of trust, gave an incentive to speculation with the available means (bonds, shares and private banker's drafts), created a mirage of wealth and generated hitherto unknown temptations.[38] If Pieter Spierenburg has told the Amsterdam stories of 'fatal attraction', adorned with the darker aspects of eighteenth-century love, then Orton's case provides proof of another emotion at work, for the effectiveness of the trap of naivety, into which a newly made businessman (a son of cheese mongers and a ship's clerk) could fall because he could not meet market requirements and financial obligations. To understand the social and cultural frames of the trap that snared Orton, Randall McGowen's conclusions are of fundamental importance. McGowen showed that the evolution of the crime of forgery, which was initially punished by fines and the 'shaming' sentence of the pillory was later treated significantly more harshly after the passing of the statute of 1729. Forging a signature and embezzling money ceased to be a 'private' offence, because lawyers and royal judicial officials considered it to undermine the stability of the state, and threaten public order. It was understood that the effective functioning of the finan-

[37] The persistence of the interpretation of punishments handed down by courts in religious terms has been shown by J. A. Sharpe, 'Civility, Civilizing Process, and the End of Public Punishment in England', in *Civil Histories. Essays Presented to Sir Keith Thomas*, ed. Peter Burke, Brian Harrison and Paul Slack, Oxford, 2000, pp. 121 f.

[38] Laurence Fontaine, 'Antonio and Shylock: Credit and Trust in France, c. 1680–c. 1780', *Economic History Review*, New Series, 54, 2001, 1, pp. 39–57. On speculative 'bubbles' see Peter M. Garber, *Famous First Bubbles: The Fundamentals of Early Manias*, Cambridge, MA, 2000; Edward Chancellor, *Devil Take the Hindmost: A History of Financial Speculation*, New York, 1999.

cial system depended on the exclusion of fraudsters from among those who transacted money.[39]

Did the case of Samuel Orton significantly change the rules of the London 'theatre of death'? The deed for which he was sentenced was not something unknown to the courts. Since 1729 forgery had been counted among the serious crimes against property and the penalties — mostly death sentences — appear ever more frequently in court judgments. On the one hand, this testifies to the dynamic growth of the public and private financial markets, and on the other it shows the system's vulnerability to abuse which was endemically short of cash and which depended on the circulation of its surrogates. The severity with which the courts treated forgers mirrored the conviction of the state judicial authorities and financial institutions that forging signatures was a serious threat to the *modus operandi* of the entire economic system. Announcements of the sentences passed on forgers regularly appeared in the newspapers. During the December 1743 session of the Old Bailey one out of the thirteen death sentences concerned the forging of a bank note; during the January session of 1751 two out of the thirteen death sentences were for forgery, and in the following session one out of nine.[40]

Orton's hanging was, therefore, nothing new, but the media gave him considerably more attention than other forgers. Cases involving financial instruments and real or imagined fraud were most often played out among London's 'middle class'. In his letter written from gaol Orton described his business trips to English ports; he traded in alcohol, but he was not a publican who serviced the criminal and 'proletarian' sub-culture of the street. He consciously shaped his profile as an entrepreneur. The description of his life and work that he offered to his readers defined — in his view at least — his 'class' and urban presence. In the eighteenth century we often find similar clashes between the image of a solid businessman and a catastrophe caused by an attempt to defraud the principles of his own ethos, for example the cases of the Perreau twins or Reverend Dodd. These cases caused surprise, provoked significant doubts as to the merits of the cases and the procedures followed, but they did not affect the severity of the judgments. Only after 1830 did such factors contribute to the change in the penal qualification of the crime.[41] Samuel Orton sought to accentuate the

[39] Spierenburg, *Written in Blood*, (n. 3), pp. 13 ff.; Randall McGowen, 'From Pillory to Gallows: the Punishment of Forgery in the Age of the Financial Revolution', *P&P*, 165, 1999, pp. 107–40.

[40] *London Magazine*, 12, 1743, p. 619; ibid., 20, 1751, pp. 43, 235.

[41] Craig Muldrew, *The Economy of Obligation: The Culture of Credit and Social Relations in Early Modern England*, London, 1998; Donna T. Andrew and Randall McGowen, *The*

difference in his own case — and his social condition — and to underline his communal and individual 'self': in his correspondence from gaol, from the cell so cold that 'he could not even pray', he asked his readers in writing to forgive him his errors and with great determination sought permission from the municipal authorities to make his last journey in a closed coach.[42] These were efforts through which he maintained to the end the image of his identity, defended his good name, and sought to avoid infamy. He was aware that he had left behind his wife and children, his circle of friends and his trading partners. His behaviour placed him in a social sphere in which the norm — still fluid — interacted with the idea of 'politeness': polished urban manners, correctness and ease in daily life and 'propriety' in professional activity.[43] As Miles Ogborn has shown, the construction of the fabric of public life in the eighteenth century began increasingly to depend on the conscious presence of 'private individuals', different — and separated — from the amorphous, aggressive crowd of the street.[44]

We can therefore speculate that Orton wished to die on his own terms. The cells in Newgate had a notorious reputation and prisoners occasionally died before the sentence could be carried out (which did not void the obligation to hang their bodies), while at Tyburn a hearse was waiting[45] in order to take the body to the cemetery. He thus avoided the

Perreaus and Mrs. Rudd: Forgery and Betrayal in Eighteenth-Century, London and Berkeley, CA, 2001.

[42] *London Magazine*, 36, 1767, p. 38. Several days before his execution, Orton had demanded that he be moved to a different cell.

[43] This discussion is of vital importance for the description of English identity in the eighteenth century. Useful introductions are offered by: Henry French, 'The Search for the "Middle Sort of People" in England, 1600–1800', *HJ*, 43, 2000, 1, pp. 277–93; Paul Langford, 'The Uses of Eighteenth-Century Politeness', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th Series, 12, 2002, pp. 311–31; Lawrence E. Klein, 'Politeness and the Interpretation of the British Eighteenth Century', *HJ*, 45, 2002, 4, pp. 869–98; Karen Harvey, 'The History of Masculinity, circa 1650–1800', *Journal of British Studies*, 44, 2005, 2, pp. 296–311.

[44] Miles Ogborn, *Spaces of Modernity: London's Geographies, 1680–1780*, New York and London, 1998, pp. 79 f. Cf. Shoemaker, 'The Decline of Public Insult' (n. 8).

[45] The gaol used the remains of the medieval gate of entry to the City of London on its western side. It was considered to be exceptionally unhealthy. A typhus epidemic in 1750 spread to the neighbouring court buildings, killing several judges and jurors. Rebuilding of the gaol (comprising three wings — for debtors, women and men) commenced in 1770, but the new premises were burnt down in the Gordon Riots of 1780. See Harold D. Kalman, 'Newgate Prison', *Architectural History*, 12, 1969, pp. 50–61. On the subject of the evolution of the undertaker's profession (from guild regulation to market competition) see Paul S. Fritz, 'The Undertaking Trade in England: Its Origins and Early Development, 1660–1830', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 28, 1994–95, 2, pp. 241–53.

fate of one of the companions of his last journey, Walker, condemned for highway robbery, whose colleagues (sailors) kidnapped the body from under the gallows, so that the corpse would not be handed over to surgeons for dissection and anatomical research, which in London street opinion was considered a final and shameful degradation. These efforts did not go unnoticed. It was written that 'Mr. Orton was the first criminal (except lord Ferrers) that has gone to Tyburn in a coach'. The comparison with the aristocrat who had been sentenced and hanged several years earlier for committing murder (he was the last member of the House of Lords to be hanged, the execution took place on 5 May 1760) should not be treated as a particular distinction for the legal qualification of the crime of forgery, as that was already unambiguous in 1767. Rather it is possible to discern the reflection of the changes in social qualifications and the individual properties of the convict's style —strongly shaped by the company he aspired to keep. Samuel Orton, a minor wholesaler of alcohol, managed to negotiate this special treatment from the managers of London's 'theatre of death'.[46]

(Translated by Richard Butterwick-Pawlikowski)

Summary

On January 14, 1767 Samuel Orton, London entrepreneur was driven to be hanged by a mourning coach. Most convicts, including those who travelled with him to the traditional city gallows at Tyburn were carted and the magistrates, who granted him this privilege were clearly making an exception. Orton's case

[46] For a case of hanging a chained corpse see the *London Magazine*, 6, 1737, p. 163. The condemned man was Jeffrey Morat, an Afro-Caribbean, who was found guilty of breaking and entering with intent to commit murder. Much significance was attached to the treatment of the body after execution. It was explained, for example, that 'the four Jews that were executed, were interr'd in their Burial-Ground at Mile-End, with their Cloaths on, and the Halters about their Necks, the Jews never stripping any Person, who does not die a natural Death', ibid., 13, 1744, p. 100. Lord Ferrers killed his servant; after the execution his body was given to surgeons. See Langbein, 'Albion's Fatal Flaws', p. 114. In 1541 the guild of surgeons obtained the right to dissect the bodies of four convicts annually. The Murder Act of 1752 strengthened that right, which was considered an additional instrument of fear and infamy. See Peter Linebaugh, 'The Tyburn Riot Against the Surgeons', in *Albion's Fatal Tree*, pp. 65–117. The nineteenth century saw the flourishing of a criminal underground which procured bodies for surgeons. Cf. Ian Ross and Carol Urquhart Ross, 'Body Snatching in Nineteenth Century Britain: From Exhumation to Murder', *British Journal of Law and Society*, 6, 1979, 1, pp. 108–18. It seems, however, that these practices had eighteenth-century origins. Cf. 'On Saturday last a man was committed to New Prison, Clarkenwell charged with stealing diverse bodies from the burrying ground in Whitecross-Street, belonging to the parish of Cripplegate, and selling them to surgeons for two guineas each, on searching the ground empty coffins were found', *Universal Magazine*, 36, 1765, p. 275.

and its analysis is informed by the detailed press reports read against the growing research into the evolution of London's eighteenth-century bloody code and urban 'theatres of death'. Strategies of penalizing crime are seen not as much in the light of statistics of death sentences as through their perception drawn by literate urban audiences from detailed press reports. The scenarios of hanging pirates, highwaymen and petty criminals traditionally included the edifying reports of the 'last dying speeches', while Orton, an educated businessman sentenced to death for a 'new crime' of forgery (punishable by death only from 1729) chose not to speak at the gallows but instead published an open letter professing himself a victim of market economy based on credit he could not satisfy. A death sentence mitigated by a gesture of granting him a coach is thus — on the one hand — a mark of lawmakers' growing determination to penalize financial transgression, while — on the other — a sign of lingering social and ethical ambiguity about harshness such decisions of the court.

Paweł Dobrowolski

Kwartalnik Historyczny
Vol. CXXI, 2014
Special Issue, pp. 95–121
PL ISSN 0023-5903

MACIEJ GÓRNY
The Tadeusz Manteuffel Institute of History
Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw

'FIVE GREAT ARMIES AGAINST OUR ENEMIES'. A COMPARATIVE STUDY IN THE HISTORY OF RACISM

Two figures are cast as the heroes of the paper. The first, Jean-Louis Armand de Quatrefages de Bréau ranks among a great number of nineteenth-century anthropologists who, although they broke no new ground in their discipline, played an important role in institutionalizing it. The second, Franciszek Henryk Duchiński, was an ethnographer-amateur, brought up in the Polish-Ukrainian milieu. Beginning in the 1840s, he was active in the circle of Polish exiles. Serious doubts have been raised as to whether he belongs in the history of science.[1] Both Quatrefages and Duchiński were the authors of racial theories that have long been regarded as eccentric. However, if the French author is usually accorded a prominent place in works on the ideology of racism and the history of science, then the Polish-Ukrainian scholar has never been given that kind of recognition.

J.-L. A. de Quatrefages de Bréau (1810–92) was a French anthropologist and zoologist. Co-founder, along with Isidore Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire and Paul Broca, of the Paris Anthropological Society, he was unstinting in his efforts to popularize science, sitting on a number of French and foreign scholarly associations.[2] He studied in Strasbourg where he was later employed as a lecturer teaching chemistry, physics and — after

[1] Stanisław Grabski noticed that 'Duchiński is not a scholar in the strict sense of the term [...]. He harnessed his pen in the service of his country and his works were designed to protect its interests.' Idem, *Życie i działalność literacka Franciszka Duchińskiego Kijowianina*, in Franciszek Henryk Duchiński, *Pisma*, 3 vols, Rapperswil 1901–03, vol. 1, p. V.

[2] On the beginnings of the French Anthropological Society see Kamil Popowicz, *Lamarkizm społeczny a rasizm i eugenika we Francji*, Warsaw, 2009, pp. 149–57. For more on Quatrefages's life see D. Ferembach, 'Jean Louis Armand de Quatrefages de Bréau (1810–1892)', *International Journal of Anthropology*, 4, 1989, pp. 305–07.

completing his education — medicine. From 1833, he worked as a doctor in Toulouse, where he founded the *Journal de Médicine et de Chirurgie de Toulouse*. After moving to Paris in 1840, he focused exclusively on the study of the problems of anthropology. An opponent of Darwin's theory, he was — according to his Polish translator — one of the very few whose criticism of Darwin's views 'sprang from a pure source of science'.[3] A Member of the Academy of Sciences and — from 1879 — the Royal Society of London, he was awarded membership of the *Légion d'Honneur*. Towards the end of his life, he presided over the Geographical Society (*Société de Géographie*) of which he had been a member since 1856.

F. H. Duchiński's life did not follow the pattern typical of a scholar.[4] Duchiński himself seems to have been very concerned about his image, inserting in his works a great number of autobiographical notes which convey the impression of an unorthodox career. He was born in Ukraine in a petty noble family. His father died when he was young, and his mother Zofia (née Bojarska) worked as a governess in the house of Count Tyszkiewicz to maintain herself and her two sons. After she died in 1829, Franciszek attended the Basilian school in Humań and later worked at a school for girls in Niemirów. In 1834 he moved to Kiev where — by his own account — he entered the Historico-Philological Faculty of the University. For a time he earned a living as a private tutor and he states that he was active in the students' organization called the Association of the Polish People. Duchiński avoided persecution after Szymon Konarski's arrest, and he remained in Kiev until the mid-1840s. In 1846 he traveled to Turkey via Odessa and then he moved to Paris. In France he began to work closely with the 'May the Third' organization. Joining the Polish Legion organized in Italy in 1848, he launched himself into propaganda activity and later served as a Polish representative, affiliated to the Istanbul legation of the Hungarian insurrectionary government. Following the defeat of the Hungarian uprising in 1849, he served as Prince Adam Czartoryski's agent in the Balkan region. It was at that time that he be-

[3] Julian Ochorowicz, 'Kilka słów tłomacza', in Adolf [sic!] Quatrefages, *Karol Darwin i jego poprzednicy. Studium nad teorią przeobrażeń*, Warsaw, 1873, p. III.

[4] Some basic biographical information is included in Grabski, *Życie*, p. I–XXXIV; August F. Grabski, 'Na manowcach myśli historycznej. Historiozofia Franciszka H. Duchińskiego', in idem, *Perspektywy przeszłości. Studia i szkice historiograficzne*, Lublin, 1983, pp. 226–39; Maria Czapska, 'Franciszek Henryk Duchiński', in: *PSB*, vol. 5, Kraków, 1939–45, pp. 441–43. Affirmative sketches on Duchiński including biographical data can be found in Agaton Giller, *O życiu i pracach F. H. Duchińskiego Kijowianina w jubileuszową rocznicę pięćdziesięcioletnich jego zasług naukowych*, Lwów, 1885; Seweryna Duchińska, *Młode lata Franciszka Duchińskiego uzupełnione rzutem oka na jego działalność naukową*, Lwów, 1897.

gan to publish his first studies in ethnography and anthropology on Russia and Ukraine. Absolved from his duties on the eve of the Crimean War, Duchiński stayed in the Balkans, publishing his articles in the *Journal de Constantinople*. In 1855 he entered English service. Officially appointed to a position of 'superintendent', entrusted with the task of supervising railway workers, he actually delivered propaganda speeches intended for British, French, and Turkish soldiers. On his return to Paris in 1856 he found employment in the Polish Higher School. In Paris he also delivered public lectures, and continued to publish. He was offered a place in the French Ethnographic Society, rising in 1871 to the position of vice-chairman. He was one of the editors of *Actes de la Société d'Ethnographie* and in 1865 joined the French Geographical Society. At that time he could pride himself on two important victories which he won in the pursuit of his 'public mission'. First, his efforts led to a change in the name of the Chair of Slavic Literature at the Collège de France. From then on, it was to be called 'the Chair of Slavic Literatures'.[5] Second, relying on the support of a French journalist and deputy, Casimir Delamarre, and a celebrated historian, Henri Martin, Duchiński managed to modify the content of some of the courses in the history of Eastern and Central Europe taught at French schools. At the beginning of the 1870s, after a short stay in Galicia, Germany, and Austria, he took up the post of curator at the Polish National Museum in Rappersvil. All his attempts to obtain a chair at the Jagiellonian University were to no avail. Nevertheless, he continued to publish articles in Polish and Ukrainian journals in an effort to promote his anthropological views. In Kraków, Duchiński even founded *Przegląd Etnograficzny* [the *Ethnographical Review*] and in 1878 he was involved in the organization of the Polish stand at the Universal Paris Exhibition. In 1885 in Lwów (Lemberg, L´viv) he celebrated the fiftieth anniversary of his scholarly work. He died one year after Quatrefages, and his obituary was published in the Ethnographic Society's newsletter.[6]

With time, the treatment accorded to both anthropologists drifted increasingly apart. Quatrefages's scholarly achievements, although long *passé*, established his place in the history of zoology and anthropology. It was not so with Duchiński. His work attracted the attention of schol-

[5] Leszek Kuk, 'Zmiana nazwy katedry słowiańskiej Collège de France w roku 1868. Z dziejów stosunku Francji wobec tzw. kwestii słowiańskiej w XIX wieku', in *Publicyści późniejszego romantyzmu wobec rządów zaborczych i spraw narodowościowych na ziemiach dawnej Rzeczypospolitej*, ed. Sławomir Kalembka, Toruń, 1998.

[6] Georges Barclay, 'Rapport annuel fait à la Société d'Ethnographie sur ses travaux et sur les progrès des sciences ethnographiques pendant l'année 1893', *Bulletin de la Société d'Ethnographie*, 35, 1893, 76, pp. 123–24.

ars interested in the history of historiography, but has remained largely ignored by historians studying the development of other scholarly disciplines.

In the 1980s Andrzej Feliks Grabski published a thorough study of Duchiński's historical thought.[7] Some references to his political activities can be found in works by Marceli Handelsman and Jerzy Skowronek,[8] while his ideas have been discussed and commented on by Andrzej Wierzbicki and several other scholars.[9] Duchiński's writings on Ukrainian issues have been dealt with by Ivan L. Rudnytsky who attempted to trace the way in which his views were received in the context of the Ukrainian nation-making process.[10]

Analysis of Duchiński's works leaves one convinced that the conclusions of scholars who have studied his thought are fully justified. The academic literature on which he drew, the scholarly apparatus with which he presented his works, and the learned societies to which he belonged were all used to advance a theory which carried overtly political connotations. The belief that Russians were of non-Slavic origin was his *idée fixe*: 'It is a grave error — common though that is — to try to understand the ties that link the Slavic nations by the study of their languages, hoping that their true nature can be probed into only through the analysis of some words carried out in a way developed by Dubrowski'.[11] Duchiński was of the opinon that 'it is only in view of the impossibility of carrying out ethnographic studies that language analysis can be resorted to [...] which however should be carried out with an awareness that its results will always remain questionable and open to debate, since languages used by different nations evolve and lend themselves to change'.[12] Anthropol-

[7] Grabski, 'Na manowcach myśli historycznej'.

[8] Marceli Handelsman, *Adam Czartoryski*, 3 vols, Warsaw, 1948–50, vol. 2, 1949, pp. 180, 276, vol. 3, pp. 483–84; idem, *Ukraińska polityka księcia Adama Czartoryskiego przed wojną krymską*, Warsaw, 1937, pp. 109–24, 145–50; Jerzy Skowronek, *Polityka bałkańska Hotelu Lambert (1833–1856)*, Warsaw, 1976, p. 151.

[9] Andrzej Wierzbicki, *Spory o polską duszę. Z zagadnień charakterologii narodowej w historiografii polskiej XIX i XX wieku*, Warsaw, 2010, pp. 198–200; idem, *Groźni i wielcy. Polska myśl historyczna XIX i XX wieku wobec rosyjskiej despotii*, Warsaw, 2001.

[10] Ivan L. Rudnytsky, 'Franciszek Duchiński and his Impact on Ukrainian Political Thought', in idem, *Essays in Modern Ukrainian History*, ed. Peter L. Rudnytsky, Edmonton, 1987, pp. 187–202.

[11] Franciszek Henryk Duchiński, 'O stosunkach Rusi z Polską i z Moskwą zwaną dzisiaj Rosją. O potrzebie dopełnień i zmian w naukowym wykładzie dziejów polskich. Przy otwarciu roku szkolnego Szkoły Wyższej Polskiej w Paryżu, przy bulwarze Mont Parnasse w dniu 7 listopada 1857 r.', in idem, *Pisma*, vol. 1, p. 64. The author was referring to the work of the illustrious Czech linguist Josef Dobrovský (1753–1829).

[12] Franciszek H. Duchiński, 'Zasady dziejów Polski i innych krajów słowiańskich i Moskwy', part 2, in idem, *Pisma*, vol. 2, p. 113.

ogy, or as Duchiński called it, ethnography, was a far more suitable method of investigation than any form of language study.

According to Duchiński, the white race is divided into Aryans and Turans. The former, comprising Slavs, Germans, and Latins, live in the region of Europe which stretches as far east as the Dnieper river. The latter, made up of Turks, Finns, and Mongols inhabit territories that lie east and south of Ukraine. The latter are still nomadic or have preserved nomadic characteristics beneath a thin layer of civilization.

'The traits of the Aryan people' — says Duchiński —

> are a fair reflection of the freedom for which they seem to have been specifically born: deeply attached to their land, they love agriculture for its own sake and not for the trading opportunities it provides. Their provincial life is thriving, individual self-reliance deeply inculcated, property rights respected, and the family name highly venerated. Feeling a deep love for their country, they are ready to make great sacrifices in its defence as well as in the furtherance of its welfare. Very emotional, but capable of controlling their passions with reason, they are blessed with a power of perseverence and creativity which they have so far been able to turn to their advantage in a variety of ways [...]. Women are held in great regard in their societies.[13]

Turans, by contrast,

> passive by nature, have displayed no originality of mind, having to content themselves with the ability to imitate others. Their blind fanaticism comes in the guise of religious devotion [...]. In their society, organized along military lines, the woman ranks low, which, for example, can clearly be seen among Turks [...]. Ages have elapsed. With the progress of civilization, the last vestiges of nomadism have disappeared in Europe without a trace, but the descendants of the old nomads have preserved their fathers' propensities.[14]

Duchiński was particularly concerned with one branch of Turans: the Muscovites whom he refused to count as a Slavic people. Cultural imports into Russia (that is, via Ukraine), made possible through the influence exercised by Kievan Rus´, could not result in transforming the essential characteristics which typify the Finno-Mongol people. This belief led him to formulate some original views concerning Russia's history and geography. He argued that the Ural Mountains could not be regarded as marking

[13] Idem, 'Pierwotne dzieje Polski', in idem, *Pisma*, vol. 3, pp. 15–16.
[14] Ibid., pp. 17–18.

a boundary between Europe and Asia — a conclusion which could be justified on the grounds that the areas on both sides of the Urals, ridges were populated by the same people. When judged from Moscow's point of view, claimed Duchiński, the Tatar invasion should be treated as a blessing:

> The invasions of Mongols and Tatars did not result in the separation of Moscow from Ruthenia as there had never been a bond of moral unity between the two. Quite the contrary, the invasions were beneficial in fostering the 'laws of race' to be followed by the Muscovites — by merging such tribes as the Suzdal, Wess, Myera, Muromians, and Chuvash with the Muscovites whose settlements ranged over the region of Kazan and behind the Oka river and who remained under the rule of national khans. [...] Thus the conquest of Genghis Khan should not be viewed as harming but rather as benefiting the Suzdal Muscovites, since it served to engender laws of tribal purity which are even more craved for by pastoral and mercantile societies than by Indo-European ones.[15]

Racial differences were in Duchiński's opinion permanent. He stated that he would be happy to see Russia free and Catholic, but, he added, 'even free and Catholic Russians will remain different from Indo-Europeans in the mission with the execution of which they had been entrusted here on earth.'[16] For Duchiński the Europeanization of Russia was nothing but a chimera.

The Muscovites distinguish themselves from Europeans in general, and from the 'real' Ruthenians in particular, by both their appearance and mentality. This point, which Duchiński believed could be seen with the naked eye, was to serve as the evidence supporting his thesis about racial differences. 'Indo-European people' — he wrote in one of his works —

> are physically more refined while the Turanian people constitute an unformed mass, just raw and unprocessed meat. The head of these people has barely come out of the nape of their necks, it simply has not yet fully set itself apart from their back and their legs have barely sprouted out of their loin. [...] What strikes you the moment you see a Muscovite is neither a face nor a head, but a neck. The neck is simply the essence of the Muscovite. With the neck too big in proportion to the head, and generally to the rest of the body, their noses are as upturned as to leave the hair inside clearly visible.[17]

[15] Idem, 'Zasady dziejów Polski i innych krajów słowiańskich i Moskwy', part 3, in idem, *Pisma*, vol. 2, p. 243.

[16] Idem, *Odezwa do ziomków*, Paris, 1861, p. 3.

[17] Idem, 'Galeria obrazów polskich. Oddział pierwszy. Różnice ludów indoeuropejskich a turańskich pod względem fizjonomii i odzieży', in idem, *Pisma*, vol. 3, pp. 212–14.

Therefore, it should not be doubted that 'these two human beings, the Muscovite and the Ruthenian, just need to cast a glance at each other to know that they have nothing in common'.[18]

According to Duchiński, it is also as a society that the Muscovites were repulsive. The word 'morality' was foreign to them. 'Generally in Moscow, and especially in relation to women, there is no other morality than that engendered exclusively by, and existing only within the confines of, the code of law, with police officers always serving as its custodians'.[19] Duchiński compared Russian women to 'emancipated Muslim women', denying their intellectual and legal independence, denouncing their indifference towards land ownership, and complaining about the 'absence of any uplifting fables from the history of their own sex'.[20] Moscow differed from Europe in almost everything: population density, landscape and climate.

The line of reasoning presented above rested on a particular set of data. Ethnographic maps, prepared by Alfred Ciszkiewicz, secretary to L'École Spéciale d'Architecture in Paris, were included in some of Duchiński's books. In creating the maps, Ciszkiewicz followed the instructions given by Duchiński himself. East of the Dnieper River, the maps show the mosaic of the Turanian people, while the category of Russians remained entirely absent from them. One such map was to be presented during the anthropological exhibition organized as part of the Paris Universal Exposition in 1878. Henryk Sienkiewicz who saw the exhibition made some approving, though hardly detailed, comments on it: 'Ciszkiewicz's ethnographic map offers a good description of the tribes that inhabit our lands and is likely to be of some use in resolving scholarly disputes'.[21] Duchiński's argument was that used in craniology, which was then undergoing dynamic development, by claiming that skull measurements, too, lent credence to his theory.[22] He illustrated his disquisitions concerning social ills found in the Tsarist Russia with statistical tables.[23]

[18] Ibid., p. 216.

[19] Idem, *Pomnik nowogrodzki. Periodyczne wyjaśnienia projektu rządu moskiewskiego, aby uroczyście obchodzić w następnym 1862 r., jakoby tysiąc-letnią rocznicę założenia dzisiejszego państwa moskiewskiego w Nowogrodzie, miewane publicznie (obecnie w Paryżu)*, Paris, 1861, p. 15.

[20] Idem, 'Pomnik nowogrodzki. Periodyczne wyjaśnienia projektu rządu moskiewskiego, aby uroczyście obchodzić w następnym 1862 r. jakoby tysiąc-letnią rocznicę założenia dzisiejszego państwa moskiewskiego w Nowogrodzie', in idem, *Pisma*, vol. 3, p. 170.

[21] Henryk Sienkiewicz, 'Z wystawy antropologicznej w Paryżu', *Nowiny*, 42, 11 August 1878.

[22] See, for example, Franciszek H. Duchiński (de Kiew), *Peuples aryâs et tourans, agricultureurs et nomades. Nécessité des réformes dans l'exposition de l'histoire des peuples Aryâs-européens & Tourans, particulièrement des Slaves et des Moscovites*, Paris, 1864, p. XXX.

[23] Cf. ibid., pp. 82–90.

Thus, Duchiński placed great importance upon maintaining a wide scholarly network, a matter to which we shall return later.

On the eve of the January Uprising of 1863 he sought to obtain, however unsuccessfully, subsidies for the '*Revue*, to be published in French with a view to disseminating my principles'.[24] All his efforts were based upon the belief that 'the world is governed by either good or bad science'.[25]

Duchiński's theories have received strong criticism from modern historians. The interpretation put forward by Andrzej Feliks Grabski remains fully justified. Grabski demonstrated that it was the influence of Joseph Arthur de Gobineau that hung heavily upon the *oeuvre* of Duchiński whose works are permeated with aggressive nationalism and extreme conservatism.[26] In this context, Andrzej Walicki mentioned Cyprian Kamil Norwid's remark that asked rhetorically: 'How can one remain a religious person after subordinating all dimensions of the history of human beings to strict laws of racial development and ethnographic conditions?'.[27] Rudnytsky, however, is inclined to take a more positive view of the political influence that Duchiński's racial theories exerted upon the Ukrainian nation-making process.[28] What links all the scholars mentioned above is the fact that their analyses have been confined only to the history of ideas — Polish or Ukrainian. When approached from this angle, the question of the extent to which Duchiński may have influenced foreign authors is only of secondary importance and remains unexplored. It is, therefore, worth taking this neglected approach to Duchiński's work.

In a recently published paper on the French 'turanism', Marléne Laurelle has noted with some discomfort that the teacher from the Polish lyceum managed to influence some prominent figures of French public life: Henri Martin, Albert Reville, August Vicquesnel, Charles de Steinbach, Casimir Delamarre, Édouard Talbot, Emmanuel Henri Victurnien marquis de Noailles, Élias Regnault and others.[29] As she says, in the 1860s the 'Turan' thesis became one of the main elements of French Russophobia.[30] The examination of the case of H. Martin, the most distinguished of the French advo-

[24] Idem, *Odezwa do ziomków Kijowianina Duchińskiego*, Paris, 1862.

[25] Ibid., p. 44.

[26] Grabski, 'Na manowcach myśli historycznej'.

[27] Cyprian Kamil Norwid, *Pisma wszystkie*, ed. Juliusz W. Gomulicki, 11 vols, Warsaw, 1971–76, vol. 10, 1971, p. 102, quotation from Andrzej Walicki, *Między filozofią, religią i polityką. Studia o myśli polskiej epoki romantyzmu*, Warsaw, 1983, p. 217.

[28] Rudnytsky, 'Franciszek Duchiński', pp. 187–202.

[29] Marléne Laurelle, 'La Question du "touranisme" des Russes. Contribution à une histoire des échanges intellectuels en Allemagne — France — Russie au XIe siècle', *Cahiers du Monde Russe*, 45, 2004, 1–2, p. 17.

[30] Ibid., p. 61.

cates of Duchiński's theories, enables one to trace the influence the latter exercised upon the way in which Russians were perceived by some authors in France. Although favourably inclined towards the Poles, and involved in publishing pro-Polish articles during the 1863–64 Uprising, Martin at first remained sceptical about Duchiński's theories.[31] However, having listened to a number of lectures delivered by the Pole, he changed his mind and even sent Duchiński a letter in which he informed him of his new attitude (and Duchiński of course did not neglect to publish some of its fragments). 'The Muscovites, Turans by race and spirit, are not part of a European community; they sow confusion and disorientation; they will never become a harmonious element'.[32] Two years later, he published a book, *La Russie et l'Europe*, in which he repeated almost *in extenso* all Duchiński's theses.[33] In the conclusion he wrote: 'the Muscovite is alien to the European family'.[34] Other French advocates of Duchiński's theory also developed a habit of repeating his views — sometimes to the point of laying themselves open to charges of plagiarism, for they included no footnotes. Many times they repeated the view that Nestor was a Polish chronicler. Without crediting the source, they also drew on Duchiński's French translation — the first ever — of some excerpts of Karamzin's works.[35]

It was no different with Duchiński's attempts to delimit the areas ostensibly inhabited by Indo-Europeans. The only work that stood out from the remainder of the French publications indebted to Duchiński's ideas was that presented by É. Regnault. He offered a systematic classification of Duchiński's views, dividing them according to different categories: geological, hydrographic, ethnographic, and those pertaining to the type of soil, customs and social norms. He also made some references to the criticism of Duchiński's theories — whose name was mentioned several times in his study[36] — raised by Russian scholars, or by those who represented Russian institutions. The 'politics of history' pursued by the Hôtel Lambert faction

[31] See Henri Martin, *Pologne et histoire*, Paris, 1863. This work collecting articles that had originally been published in various newsapers did not touch on racial questions at all.

[32] 'Les Moscovites, touraniens de race et de génie, ne sont pas de la société européenne; ils la troublent et la désorganisent; ils n'en seront jamais un élément harmonique', Duchiński (de Kiew), *Peuples aryâs et tourans*, p. VII.

[33] Henri Martin, *La Russie et l'Europe*, Paris, 1866, especially pp. II–III, 8–17 and 98–120.

[34] 'Le Moscovite, étranger à la famille européenne', ibid., p. 259.

[35] See, for example, the map included in the work by A. Charlier de Steinbach, *La Moscovie et l'Europe. Étude historique, ethnographique et statistique*, Paris, 1863.

[36] Élias Regnault, *La question européenne improprement appelée polonaise. Réponse aux objections présentées par M. M. Pogodine, Schédo-Ferroti, Porochine, Schnitzler, Soloviev, etc., contre le polonisme des provinces lithuano-ruthènes et contre le non-slavisme des Moscovites*, Paris, 1863, pp. 7–10 and 149–53.

played a noteworthy, but secondary, role in the history of the French reception of Duchiński's work. The Kiev scholar often relied on the financial support of the Czartoryski family. Some of his French publications appeared thanks to subsidies he received from the Treasury Office. However, it needs to be said that some of his advocates, including Regnault, could count on the same kind of support.[37]

One can indicate several factors that stood behind the specificity characterizing Duchiński's presence in the works of French authors who drew on his theories. The first and perhaps the most important one concerned Duchiński's way of treating his theses (and actually one main thesis). He considered their dissemination to be his quasi-religious duty, regarding his scholarly efforts as serving a patriotic purpose of liberating Ruthenia which was to be forever united with Poland. In his proclamation to the insurrectionary government in 1863 he declared: 'We are going to deprive the Muscovites of part of their strength by employing their own methods of fighting, that is, by exercising the right of naming. We are going to make the Muscovites go by the name of the Muscovites, denying their right to use names which they have appropriated in an effort to legitimate the annexation of the greater part of Poland, Ruthenia'.[38] Motivated by a sense of mission, he was not troubled by the question of whether his French followers were willing to acknowledge openly their intellectual debt. The Polish ethnographer clearly was prepared to content himself with some sort of a tacit partnership. His wife, Seweryna Duchińska, who left Poland after the fall of the January Uprising, reminisced about his passion for promoting works by other authors. Not only was he in the habit of encouraging their publications, but sometimes also had a hand in writing them.

Before the publication of Martin's work on Poland and Russia 'the Post Office sent in stacks of cards to the French historian's residence address on Rue Montparnasse'.[39] Moreover, prior to the enactment of the changes in the French school curriculum, Duchiński worked closely with C. Delamarre.[40] Providing the authors whom he had befriended with statistical data and scholarly works he had been collecting over a long time, he felt no need to prevent them from copying this material into their own works, which were soon to be published under their own names.

---

[37] See Władysław Czartoryski, *Pamiętnik 1860–1864. Protokoły posiedzeń biura Hotelu Lambert part. I and II. Entrevues politiques*, Warsaw, 1980, pp. 211, 218 and 296.

[38] Franciszek Henryk Duchiński, *Do Rządu Narodowego Powstańczego od będącego obecnie na służbie krajowej w Paryżu Kijowianina Duchińskiego przedstawienie*, Paris, 1863, p. 6.

[39] Seweryna Duchińska, *Wspomnienia z 29cio-letniego pożycia z mężem moim 1864–1893*, Paris, 1894, p. 27.

[40] Ibid., pp. 69–70.

The second factor which can explain the fact that Duchiński was not given sufficient acknowledgement in French works on Turanian people was his fear of eliciting a hostile reaction from the Russian authorities. His conjecture that he was being followed turned out to be true.[41] His wife argued that in 1865, following the intervention of the Russian embassy, her husband had to give up delivering his public speeches, thus having been left with no other option but to confine himself to writing.[42] The adherence to his principles was also to hinder the careers of his French friends. Duchińska recollected that 'by working so closely with Vicquesnel, my husband had to put up with a great deal of disagreeable remarks from Vicquesnel's wife. That proud and wayward woman grumbled bitterly that her husband, despite huge accomplishments to his credit, had not yet been awarded the Cross of the *Légion d' Honneur*. This failure was the result of the excessively cautious conduct of the Bonapartists and other doctrinaires who were afraid of offending the Muscovites resentful at the exclusion from the Slavic World'.[43] Duchiński's role in preparing the anthropological Exhibition in 1878 was also to be more crucial and more important than was officially acknowledged. In this case, too, it was the fear of the 'north wind' blowing from St Petersburg that was to blame for hiding the Polish scholar's contribution to the organization of this event.[44]

Duchiński's theories also reverberated throughout German-speaking countries. Delamarre's pamphlet was published in German (it was translated into German by one of Duchiński's acquaintances — Charlier de Steinbach) in parallel with Emperor Napoleon III's order enacting the change in the name of the Chair of the Slavic Literatures at the Collège de France.[45] In his pamphlet Delamarre expressed astonishment that such sterling scholars as Germans still permitted themselves to be deceived by Russian propaganda. The French author tried to blame it on, at least in part, some extra-scholarly factors: 'It is a Slavic scholar, Mr Duchiński of Kiev, to whom we owe these new ideas. And perhaps it is his origin that is in part responsible for German scholars' distrust with which they have treated his theories'.[46] Contrary to this opinion, Duchiński's ideas met with the approval of

[41] See Grabski, 'Na manowcach myśli historycznej', p. 235.

[42] Duchińska, *Wspomnienia*, p. 38.

[43] Ibid., pp. 30–31.

[44] Ibid., pp. 171–72.

[45] Casimir Delamarre, *Ein Volk von fünfzehn Millionen Seelen welches von der Geschichte vergessen worden ist. Eine Petition an den französischen Senat*, Paris, 1869.

[46] 'Diese Reformen verdanken wir allerdings einem slawischen Gelehrten, dem Herrn Duchinski aus Kiew, und das ist vielleicht ein Grund für manchen deutschen Geschichtsforscher, eine gewisse Abneigung gegen dieselben zu hegen', ibid., p. 5.

some German authors who, unlike their French colleagues, fully recognized his role in proving Russia's true ethnic nature. The theory also attracted the attention of Karl Marx.[47] But it was an archeologist and historian from the Polytechnic in Zurich, Gottfried Kinkel, who tried to probe deeper into the theory by writing two extensive papers on it.[48] He also wrote enthusiastic reviews of Duchiński's 'Swiss' lectures. The reviews appeared in *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* and in Vienna's *Neue Freie Presse*.[49] It was also in Vienna that one of Emil Hervet's pamphlets, translated into German, was published.[50] Duchiński's 'Turan' theory was well-received by Austrian ethnographers, and — importantly for the foreign reception of Duchiński's work — the acceptance it gained in the circle of Austrian scholars had nothing to do with the latter's anti-Russian prejudices. They regarded it as expressing objective facts which were helpful, although not crucial, in explaining the 'ethnogenesis' of the Ruthenian inhabitants of the Austrian Empire.[51]

In Poland Duchiński was considered a controversial thinker. Both at home and in exile he had as many avid adherents, who were deeply convinced of the validity of his views, as opponents for whom his theories were entirely without foundation. *Przegląd Rzeczy Polskich* (The Review of the Polish Affairs) discussed Duchiński's theses in a polemical exchange with Aleksandr Herzen and Nikolai Ogarev.[52] Henryk Kamieński passed his theory under a critical review.[53] In Galicia Stefan Buszczyński served as a reliable distributor of Duchiński's ideas. There was clearly an irony

---

[47] In a letter to Friedrich Engels written in 1865 Marx subscribed to Duchiński's theory. For Marx the theory's practical consequences were more important than its verification. 'Ich wünsche' — he wrote — 'daß Duchiński recht hat und at all events diese Ansicht herrschend unter den Slawen würde'. Karl Marx to Friedrich Engels, London, 24 June 1865, in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Werke*, 43 vols, Berlin, 1956–90, vol. 31, 1973, p. 127. A few years later the philosopher arrived at the conclusion that Duchiński went too far in pursuing his theory. Marx himself tended to subscribe to the view that Mongol origin could be proved only in relation to the Russian élites: Karl Marx to Ludwig Kugelmann, London, 17 February 1870, in Marks and Engels, *Werke*, vol. 32, 1974, pp. 649–51.

[48] Gottfried Kinkel, *Polens Auferstehung — die Stärke Deutschlands*, Vienna, 1868; idem, *La Renaissance de la Pologne envisagée comme la force de l'Allemagne*, Zürich, 1868.

[49] Quotations in Delamarre, *Ein Volk von fünfzehn Millionen Seelen*, pp. 6–8.

[50] Emil Hervet, *Ethnographie Polens. Bericht über die Arbeiten der Frau Severine Duchinska, Mitglied der ethnographischen und geographischen Gesellschaft von Paris gelesen in der ethnographischen Gesellschaft zu Paris in der Sitzung vom 15. März 1869*, Vienna, 1871.

[51] See Hermann Ignaz Bidermann, *Die ungarischen Ruthenen, ihr Wohngebiet, ihr Erwerb und ihre Geschichte*, 2 vols, Innsbruck, 1862–67, vol. 2, pp. 7–22.

[52] Andrzej Nowak, *Polacy, Rosjanie i biesy. Studia i szkice historyczne z XIX i XX wieku*, Kraków, 1998, p. 138.

[53] See idem, *Jak rozbić rosyjskie imperium? Idee polskiej polityki wschodniej (1733–1921)*, Kraków, 1999, p. 268.

in the pseudonym (S. Bezstronny — Impartial) under which Buszczyński published his anti-Russian tirades.[54] The Kiev scholar gained much popularity in Poland in the period preceding the outbreak of the 1863 Uprising when it was easier for his works to be distributed without censorship. The Orgelbrand Encyclopedia's entry on Duchiński, authored at that time by Julian Bartoszewicz, contains the following information: 'Duchiński [...], to be honest, reiterated long held opinions on the problem which uneducated gentry of the Polish Republic had understood much better than some scholars of today'.[55]

The same reasons for which the theory became so popular in pre-insurrectionary Warsaw determined the Russian reception of it. Just as was the case with Duchiński's French followers, his Russian commentators, too, rarely acknowledged where the ideas originated. In 1863 Mikhail Pogodin wrote a polemical review of Duchiński's theses.[56] Characteristically enough, it was not Duchiński but the editor-in-chief of *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Adolphe d'Avril, to whom Pogodin adressed his polemic. Avril, it is worth noting, offered a recapitulation of this Polish-Russian controversy surrounding the problem of the Slavic origin of the Russians, leaning towards Duchiński's view that there were serious anthropological differences to be discerned between the Muscovites and Ruthenians.[57] Pogodin, in turn, contended that there was no point in arguing with Duchiński,

---

[54] S. Bezstronny [Stefan Buszczyński], *Okrucieństwa Moskali. Chronologiczny rys prześladowania potomków Słowian przez carów i moskiewski naród od dawnych wieków aż do dni dzisiejszych. Przestroga historii dla południowej Słowiańszczyzny i tak zwanych panslawistów*, Lwów, 1890; see also idem, *Bestandteile der Russischen Bevölkerung und deren Confessionen von 85 Jahren*, Lemberg, 1875; idem, *Posłannictwo Słowian i odrębność Rusi. Rzut oka na Słowiańszczyznę*, Kraków, 1885; idem, *Rachunek polskiego sumienia. Rozmyślanie w niewoli*, Kraków, 1883; Buszczyński is likely to have given a summarized account of Duchiński's ideas entitled *Die Wunden Europas*, Leipzig, 1875. On Buszczyński see Krzysztof Daszyk, *Strażnik romantycznej tradycji. Rzecz o Stefanie Buszczyńskim*, Kraków, 2001, in which the author steers carefully clear of the problem of racism in the anti-Russian concepts put forward by Duchiński and Buszczyński, highlighting instead the confluence of their ideas with those advocated by some Russian authors (ibid., pp. 158–62). See also [anon.] *Życiorys Stefana Buszczyńskiego*, Kraków, 1894. On the role of Duchiński's theory in Buszczyński's works see Maciej Górny, 'Das ethnographische Motiv in den polnischen Föderationsplänen des 19. Jahrhunderts', in *Option Europa. Deutsche, polnische und ungarische Europapläne des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Włodzimierz Borodziej and others, 3 vols, Göttingen 2005, vol. 1, pp. 187–204; and idem, 'Argument z etnografii w polskich planach federacyjnych XIX wieku', *Borussia*, 2004, 35, pp. 139–50.

[55] *Encyklopedia powszechna*, 28 vols, Warsaw, 1859–68, vol. 7, 1861, p. 556.

[56] Mikhail Pogodin, *Pol´skoi vopros. Sobranīe razsuzhdenīi, zapisok i zamiechanīi*, Moscow, 1863, pp. 124–44.

[57] V. de Mars [Adolphe d'Avril], 'La Pologne, ses anciennes provinces et ses véritables limites', *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 33, 1863, 45, pp. 497–527.

since his theory was nothing more than the expression of a disposition characteristic of the nation to which he belonged. At the same time, the Russian author was appalled at the fact that such ideas could find favour with serious scholarly journals in the West.[58] Although both Pogodin and Viktor Stepanovich Poroshin, another Russian critic of Duchiński, tried to make their regard for Finns absolutely clear, they both put great emphasis upon the fact that whatever similarities were to be found between Fins and Russians, their source lay exclusively in similar environmental conditions.[59] Duchiński was also given a half-hearted treatment in a small monograph written by the German geographer and expert on Russia, Johann-Heinrich Schnitzler.[60] Garbling the name of the Polish scholar, Schnitzler managed to avoid making such a mistake with regard to both the Russian and French authors to whom he referred in his book. He summed up Duchiński's ideas in a rhetorical question: 'what is he trying to prove? That the real Ruthenia should belong to Poland?'[61]

At the beginning of the 1880s, Duchiński's work was singled out for as much praise as it was for criticism, the latter being even greater than that levelled at him by the Russian authors. In September 1885 he was awarded a commemorative medal designed by Karol Młodnicki. The medal had 'his portrait engraved on one side [...] and ethnographic maps showing Turan Moscow as clearly distinct from Atlantic Europe on the other. There was also an inscription engraved which read: "For the defender of historical truth in recognition of half a century of national service"'.[62] Four years earlier Wacław Nałkowski published a pamphlet entitled 'On geographical errors on which Professor Duchiński's ideas are based', in which he attacked one of the pillars of Duchiński's theory: the geographical and anthropological border on the Dnieper river.[63] Nałkowski treated the Kiev scholar's worldview with contempt, pejoratively calling it '*duchinizm*' (duhinism) or '*duchiniczność*' (duhinishness).[64] In an article published in 1885 in the journal *Kraj* ('Country'), and expanded later into a separate pamphlet (published also in Russian), Duchiński was attacked by Jan Baudouin de Courtenay. The noted linguist rejected the very idea of using science to

[58] Pogodin, *Pol´skoi vopros*, p. 125.

[59] Victor de Porochine, *Une nationalité contestée. Russie — Pologne*, Paris, 1862, p. 58.

[60] Jean-Henri Schnitzler, *L'Empire des tsars au point actuel de la science*, 4 vols, Paris, 1856–69, vol. 3, 1866; see also ibid., vol. 1.

[61] Ibid., vol. 3, p. 29 f.

[62] Duchińska, *Wspomnienia*, pp. 204–05.

[63] Wacław Nałkowski, *O geograficznych błędach, na których opierają się historiozoficzne poglądy profesora Duchińskiego*, Warsaw, 1881.

[64] Ibid., p. 54.

promote a political agenda, directing his criticism both at Russian Slavophiles and Duchiński. 'Our ethnographer', he wrote 'preaches a gospel of love between Aryan nations. This love goes hand in hand with the Aryans' indifference, if not hatred, towards the Turan world. And since all the European nations living west of the Dnieper river and "small rivers of Finland" are counted among the Aryan world, the theory is, to be sure, designed to bolster the cause of uniting the whole of Europe, including Aryan Poland, with a view to pushing Turan Moscow back to the east'.[65] The real blow was also dealt by Duchiński's countryman, Myhailo Drahomanov, who totally rejected Duchiński's theories, concentrating his criticism on views regarding the Turan origin of Cossacks.[66]

When Duchiński's life was nearing its end, every single trope followed by the authors commenting on his work had already crystallized. Both Polish and Ukrainian scholars turned to Duchiński for ethnographic and anthropological arguments — just as during his greatest scholarly triumphs after 1863 — to support the theory which excluded Russia from Europe. In the twentieth century, too, there were authors who continued to make similar use of Duchiński's work. Lonhyn Tsehel´s´kyi, for example, contended in 1915 that 'in racial terms Russians are not Slavs but only slavicized Finns'.[67] As we have already seen, historians have tended to pass a very severe judgment on Duchiński's writings, which is best seen in the title of the paper on his thought written by Andrzej Feliks Grabski 'Na manowcach myśli historycznej' ('Historical thought led astray'). Approached from this angle, Duchiński is believed to have perverted the course of nineteenth-century Polish historical thought by reducing to absurdity views and ideas expounded by such thinkers as Adam Mickiewicz, Joachim Lelewel and Maurycy Mochnacki.[68] The approval with which Duchiński's theories met in the West must, in turn, be

[65] Jan Baudouin de Courtenay, *Z powodu jubileuszu profesora Duchińskiego*, Kraków, 1886, p. 24.

[66] Myhailo Drahomanov, *Pro ukraïns´kyh kozakiv, tatar ta turkiv*, Kyïv, 1876; see the polemic [F. H. Duchiński], *Qui sont les Kosaks?*, Paris, 1877.

[67] 'Die Russen ihrer Rasse nach ja gar keine Slawen, sondern slawisierte Finnen sind': Longin Cehelskyj, *Die großen politischen Aufgaben des Krieges im Osten und die ukrainische Frage*, Berlin, 1915, p. 31. Similar comments including references to Duchiński can be found in Ludwik Kulczycki, *Panslawizm a sprawa polska*, Kraków, 1916, p. 11. The author clearly distances himself from Duchiński's theories.

[68] Among the great number of works dealing with the problem of the relation of the Polish political thought to Russia in the nineteenth century the work which sheds most light on the problem is Wierzbicki, *Groźni i wielcy*. These issues are also analysed by Irena Grudzińska-Gross, *Piętno rewolucji. Custine, Tocqueville, Mickiewicz i wyobraźnia romantyczna*, Warsaw, 2000.

viewed through the prism of Russophobic nature of Western liberalism — a point that has been noted by Hans Henning Hahn.[69]

An attempt to add new names to the list of the authors interested in Duchiński and to present more interpretations of the extravagant views to which he adhered is likely to be both interesting and instructive, but it is highly unlikely to result in new insights into his *oeuvre*. In order achieve this goal, we shall instead employ something of a comparative method which, as Marc Bloch and Jürgen Kocka have suggested, allows us to identify problems which would have otherwise gone unnoticed[70]. In what follows, we also draw inspiration from recent methodological debates among scholars of the so-called *histoire croisée*. The latter seems to be particularly helpful in studying ideology, as well as intellectual and scholarly life.[71]

It is Jean-Louis Armand de Quatrefages, the French anthropologist, whom we shall compare with Duchiński. Or, to be more precise, it is one isolated episode in Quatrefages's intellectual biography — one in which his scholarly activity became entirely subordinated to politics — that will serve here as a comparative point of reference. Quatrefages and Duchiński knew each other. The Kiev scholar met his future wife in May 1864, listening to lectures delivered by the French anthropologist in the Paris botanic garden.[72] Both were members of the Geographical Society. At the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war, Duchiński and his wife were staying at a healing resort in Bohemia, and because of the ongoing war (and later because of increasing Russian influence in French politics) the couple did not arrive back in Paris until March 1872. The couple's return to France was to remain deeply engraved in the memory of Seweryna Duchińska: 'One evening we went to a meeting of the Geographical Society. The view which emerged there before our eyes was truly horrifying. Each of the scholars had grown older by ten years. Quatrefages's hair had turned grey'.[73]

---

[69] Hans Henning Hahn, *Dyplomacja bez listów uwierzytelniających. Polityka zagraniczna Adama Jerzego Czartoryskiego 1830–1840*, Warsaw, 1987, p. 321; see also Ezequiel Adamovsky, *Euro-Orientalism. Liberal Ideology and the Image of Russia in France (c. 1740–1880)*, Bern, 2006, p. 13.

[70] Marc Bloch, 'Pour une histoire comparée des sociétés européennes' (1928), in: idem, *Mélanges historiques*, 2 vols, Paris, 1963, vol. 1, pp. 16–40; Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka, 'Vergleichende Geschichte: Methoden, Aufgaben, Probleme', in *Geschichte und Vergleich. Ansätze und Ergebnisse international vergleichender Geschichtsschreibung*, ed. Heinz-Gerhard Haupt and Jürgen Kocka, Frankfurt am Main and New York, 1996, pp. 9–45.

[71] Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann,'Beyond Comparison. *Histoire Croisée* and the Challenge of Reflexivity', *History and Theory*, 45, 2006, pp. 30–50.

[72] See Duchińska's account of the event: *Wspomnienia*, p. 16.

[73] Ibid., p. 113.

The French anthropologist may have been dejected not only by his country's defeat in the war but also by the losses that French science suffered during the siege of Paris. The bombardment of the Paris Museum in January 1871 caused much damage to zoological, botanical, and anthropological collections (although none of the museum staff were injured). Quatrefages suspected the Prussians of trying deliberately to destroy some valuable collections in an effort to weaken French science. His reaction was swift and decisive. He wrote a paper on the Prussian race.[74] It appeared in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, but was also published in the form of a separate pamphlet, first in French and after a few months in English. It is this publication that won him a place in history books on European racism.[75]

Quatrefages's pamphlet starts with assurances of the author's scholarly objectivity. He expresses the view that 'every political subdivision, founded on ethnology, immediately leads to absurdity'.[76] Nevertheless, despite his avowed caution, like Duchiński he analysed the physical appearance of the members of the Turan race. However, it was not Prussians, to whom the pamphlet was supposed to be devoted, but Estonians to whom he assigned the role of representing the race in question. It is common knowledge, says Quatrefages, that they speak a non-Aryan language resembling Finnish. It is also in terms of their physical appearance that they are similar to Finns:

> Their bust is long; their legs short, and the region of the pelvis large in proportion to that of the shoulders. [...] The eyes [...] are generally deeply

[74] Armand de Quatrefages, 'La Race prusienne', *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 41, 1871, 91, pp. 647–69. Henceforward all quotations are taken from Jean-Louis Armand de Quatrefages, *The Prussian Race Ethnologically Considered. To Which is Appended Some Account of the Bombardment of the Museum of Natural History, etc. by the Prussians in January 1871*, London, 1872.

[75] See, for example, Juan Comas, *Racial Myths. The Race Question in Modern Science*, Paris, 1958, pp. 42–48; Leon Poliakov, *Der arische Mythos. Zu den Quellen von Rassismus und Nationalismus*, Hamburg, 1993, pp. 295–97; idem, Christian Delacampagne and Patrick Girard, *Über den Rassismus. Sechzehn Kapitel zur Anatomie, Geschichte und Deutung des Rassenwahns*, Frankfurt am Main, 1984; Lothar Baier, 'Odwracalność stereotypów — przykład francusko-niemiecki', in *Narody i stereotypy*, ed. Teresa Walas, Kraków, 1995, pp. 194–97; Ivan Hannaford, *Race. The History of an Idea in the West*, Washington, DC, 1996, pp. 287–90; Popowicz, *Lamarkizm społeczny a rasizm i eugenika*, pp. 170–72; Gerhard Ahlbrecht, *Preußenbäume und Bagdadbahn. Deutschland im Blick der französischen Geo-Disziplinen (1821–2004)*, Passau, 2006; and also older works accepting racial assumptions, for example William Z. Ripley, *The Races of Europe. A Sociological Study*, New York, 1899, pp. 219–21; idem, 'The Racial Geography of Europe', *Appleton's Popular Science Monthly*, 52, 1898, pp. 49–56.

[76] Quatrefages, *The Prussian Race*, p. 2.

> set; the nose, straight and but little rounded, is often too small for the width of the cheeks, and the space separating it from the mouth is too.[77]

Having characterized the Estonians, he turns to depicting the Latvians. The latter, in contrast to their neighbours from the North, use the Aryan language. However, from the anthropological point of view, they need to be ranked among a 'group of races named by turn Tchudes, Mongolians, Turanians, and North Ouralians'.[78] With the ground thus prepared, Quatrefages tries to develop his argument by drawing on an observation made by another member of the Anthropological Society, Charles Rochet, on the appearance of Prussian soldiers from Pomerania.[79] Although Prussians are a little taller than Estonians and Latvians, there is clearly, according to both French scholars, a far-reaching resemblance between them.[80] Their disproportionate shapes — similar to those discerned by Duchiński in the Muscovites — stemmed from the fact that Finns were descendants of the most primordial and, by extension, the most primitive people in Europe — paleolithic hunters. And at this point Quatrefages referred back to Duchiński's opinion indicating the Lithuanians' physical likeness to the Bretons. From this it followed, according to the French anthropologist, that it was the common Finnish component — which in Lithuanians combined with the Aryan traits of Slavs and in Bretons with the Aryan traits of Celts — that must have been responsible for the development of features commonly characterizing both groups.[81]

Finns, continues Quatrefages, are both physically and psychologically distinct from Aryans. They are calm, deeply attached to their own traditions, but also mistrustful:

> Unhappily all the good in this picture is marred by a quality which seems to be thoroughly national. The Finn never pardons a real or supposed offence, avenges it on the first opportunity, and is not fastidious in his choice of means. Thus is explained the frequency of assassination in Finland amongst the peasants.[82]

The qualities of Prussia's primordial inhabitants, conquered later by Slavs, merged with the conquerors' worst qualities — a lust for conquest

[77] Ibid., p. 19.
[78] Ibid., p. 21.
[79] Charles Rochet, 'Communication sur le type prussien', *Bulletins de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris*, 1871, pp. 75–77 and 188–96.
[80] Quatrefages, *The Prussian Race*, p. 37.
[81] Ibid., p. 35.
[82] Ibid., p. 61.

and proclivity for betrayal. Germans were the next group to subjugate the local population, absorbing old-Prussian elites and, according to Quatrefages, benefitting Prussians in the greatest degree. But it was the French Huguenots who managed to secure for themselves a dominant position within the élite of the country, becoming the only group capable of producing high cultural values.

The fact that Prussians constituted — according to Quatrefages's characterization — a mixture of four nations and two races, Finno-Turan primordial Prussians, Aryan Slavs, Germans and the French, did not mean that their qualities were merely an amalgam of the qualities possessed by each of the races. Quite the contrary, the two primordial groups were able to dominate those who arrived later: 'The German or the Frenchmen would naturally turn into a Slav or a Finn'.[83] This was to be particularly conspicuous in the French who were still bound through language with their old motherland, but who from the racial viewpoint had already been 'Prussianized': 'Men were to be found only too easily in all ranks of the Prussian population and army who spoke French purely and without a German accent. These had no difficulty in passing themselves off as Frenchmen, in slipping in everywhere, in surprising and betraying what it was most important for us to conceal, and in preaching undiscipline and insurrection'.[84] The fate suffered in France by Huguenot families was a blow to both those families and to France itself. Quatrefages, who was a Protestant himself, wept bitterly over their misery which finally turned out to be a factor in France's defeat. Moreover, these French Protestants, who had once been forced to abandon France, failed to reach the level of racial maturity that had already been achieved by their former brothers in the old country. This was because the Prussian race was not yet fully shaped. Instead it was still passing through the barbarian stage of its development.

An interesting aspect of Quatrefages's remarks concerns the relationship between Germans and Prussians. At this point, too, his views are clearly in keeping with those articulated by Duchiński. The French anthropologist arrived at the conclusion that, in racial terms, Germans were a world apart from Prussians. The acceptance of the Prussian leadership by Germans should be regarded as a misunderstanding, an 'anthropological mistake', for 'in every respect, Prussia is ethnologically distinct from the peoples she now rules over, through the plea of a (pretended) unity of race'.[85]

[83] Ibid., p. 65.
[84] Ibid., p. 85.
[85] Ibid.

In the conclusion of his work, Quatrefages made one more reference to Duchiński without mentioning his name. After France's defeat, dark clouds, he wrote, were gathering over Europe; for Prussian pan-Germanism was raising the spectre of Russian pan-Slavism. 'In the possible conflicts caused by these pretensions, what will Prussia do? Will she turn her cannon against her formidable neighbour? Or will she then invoke the affinity of race, as she now invokes the affinity of language, rivet the bonds which already exist? Will the Slavo-Finnic races wish to reign altogether, over Germans and Latins? And would the world, thus shared, submit in silence?'.[86]

Unlike other French authors writing about Turans, Quatrefages wrote his pamphlet alone. The fact that the views articulated in his work were in several ways similar to those held by Duchiński was not just the result of mere imitation. During his short stay in Paris in the spring of 1872, Duchiński tried to develop further the part of Quatrefages's argument which he regarded as most important. At the meeting of the Geographical Society held on 19 April 1872, Duchiński delivered a lecture in which he developed and modified the line of reasoning followed by Quatrefages in the conclusion of his work on the Prussian race. Pan-Slavism, he argued, should be treated as an exact copy of pan-Germanism, that is, as nothing but a tool likely to be used for legitimizing the idea of ruthless conquest. At the same time, he expressed an opinion which ran counter to what Quatrefages had written, namely that people who inhabited the areas east of the Dnieper River were not a Slav-Finnic mixture, representing instead a pure Asian, Turan race.[87] To be sure, for the advocates of Duchiński's theories it was simply out of the question to link Slavs with Finns. The fact that Quatrefages viewed the former as ranking among the Aryan race still was not enough to satisfy Duchiński's followers.

While the pamphlet dealing with the Prussians could not borrow too much from works on the Russians, structural parallels discerned in the works of both scholars are striking. A theory popular in the nineteenth century which fed upon some remarks found in Tacitus' *Germania* served as a point of departure for both scholars. According to this theory, Finns were the first savage population to have inhabited northern Europe, long before the advent of the Aryan people.[88] In describing the physical traits

[86] Ibid., pp. 86–87.

[87] 'Société de géographie. Séance du 19 avril [1872]', *La Revue Politique et Littéraire. Revue des Cours Littéraires*, ser. 2, 1, 1872, 44, pp. 1044–45.

[88] See, for example, James Covles Prichard, *Eastern Origin of the Celtic Nations*, Oxford, 1831; for more on the problem of nineteenth-century interpretations concerning the ethnogenesis of the Finns see Anssi Halmesvirta, *The British Conception of the*

of the Turan race, both authors drew attention to the fact that Turans were not proportionally built.

In characterizing a Muscovite, Duchiński is likely to have had before his eyes a figure resembling an Estonian or a Latvian as found in the work of Quatrefages. There are also some clear similarities present in the psychological characterization of the races in question offered by both authors. Both groups of Turans are believed to be guided in their social life by veneration for power and lust for conquest. Differences between them are either apparent or of secondary importance. While Duchiński claims that the Muscovites have no difficulty in forsaking their traditions, Quatrefages argues that Finns are deeply attached to theirs. However, when one takes a closer look at the analyses carried out by both scholars, then it turns out that Duchiński did not fail to see that some basic elements of the Turan culture and psyche refused to lend themselves to change. In turn, Quatrefages noted that both 'autochthonic' Prussian races tended to copy the cultural patterns of others.[89] Both visions drew heavily on the views — very popular at that time — that divided human kind into 'active' and 'passive' races, or, as in the works by Gustav Klemm, into 'male' or 'female' people.[90] The most important, one might say 'practical', conclusion to be drawn from the works of both scholars concerns the mechanism of exclusion from the European family of nations. Both Duchiński and Quatrefages carry out the same manoeuvre of separating the elements they regard as racially alien from those they consider racially related. Duchiński launches into the struggle for perpetuating the image of Ruthenia as racially different from Moscow. Quatrefages tries to 'save' for the Aryan race Germans from western and southern Europe.

To detect significant differences one needs to look not so much at the structure of both theories as to the narrative styles. Quatrefages declares his adherence to such values as scholarly objectivity and common sense. Accepting the idea of the inequality of races, he criticizes the theory, assumed to be entertained by Prussians, that races are necessarily hostile to each other. In terms of scholarly apparatus, he remains in harmony with the ideologized, but logically impeccable, exposition of his

---

Finnish 'Race', Nation and Culture, 1760–1918, Helsinki, 1990; and A. Kemiläinen, *Finns in the Shadow of the 'Aryans'. Race Theories and Racism*, Helsinki, 1998.

[89] 'The Fin or the Slave might ameliorate the conditions of his existence, change his religion, cultivate his mind, and raise his intelligence, but his fundamental nature must necessarily remain the same', Quatrefages, *The Prussian Race*, p. 64.

[90] Gustav Klemm, *Cultur-Geschichte des christlichen Europa*, 2 vols Leipzig, 1851–52, vol. 2: *Osteuropa*.

views. In contrast, Duchiński appears to be a talented amateur. He invokes the authority of science, trying to keep his line of reasoning as clear and coherent as possible. But at the same time he makes no secret of the fact that the most important task he has set himself does not consist of contributing to the progress of science or to the development of knowledge, but to the liberation of Poland and Ukraine. Science is just one of the means — and obviously not the most important — that can be used to achieve the political goal he has in mind. During the celebrations of fifty years of his scholarly work in 1885, he expounded views which Quatrefages would probably never have claimed to hold:

> We have raised five great armies against our enemies [...]. The first army of ours is the trust we put in God that He will never allow the lie to prevail. The second army — ethnography. The third one — geography in the widest possible sense of the term. The fourth army — statistics. And the fifth — philosophy. It is those armies that we are going to lead into battle — sometimes relying only on some of them, and sometimes using them all at once.[91]

The French edition of the work of Max Müller (*La Science de la religion*), one of the proponents of the 'Aryan myth', containing critical comments penned by Duchiński's wife in the margins of the text (held by the National Library in Warsaw) is a very interesting document. It sheds much light upon the religious perspective which can clearly be detected in the opinion quoted above and which was evidently shared by the married couple.[92] Müller considers the correct method of classifying different religions and arrives at the conclusion that 'the only true and proper classification of religions is the same as the classification of languages'. Duchińska's comment on this opinion attests to her holding of a different worldview. 'This lies in God's jurisdiction. And God speaks through substantive laws'.[93]

All the parallels between the racial theories developed by Duchiński and Quatrefages are grounded in the identical positions they occupied and in the similarly identical discourse within which they operated. Direct references were of secondary importance. It is no coincidence that Quatrefages, in preparing the pamphlet edition of his text, removed some direct references to Duchiński which had previously been included in the paper published in *Revue des Deux Mondes*. In this paper he also added a footnote

[91] Franciszek Henryk Duchiński, *Drugi mój 25-letni jubileusz*, Paris, 1885, p. III.

[92] Friedrich Max Müller, *La Science de la religion*, Paris, 1873.

[93] Ibid., p. 71; quotation from idem, *Religia jako przedmiot umiejętności porównawczej. Wykłady*, Kraków, 1873, p. 55.

to a passage concerning the Slavs. The footnote referred to the maps prepared by Duchiński and used by Vicquesnel.[94] but it remains absent from further editions of 'La Race prusienne'. One may presume that it was the change in the European constellation of powers that made the appeal to an anti-Russian emigrant no longer appealing. Besides, in the 1870s Duchiński — unlike Quatrefages — was not at the height of his intellectual powers and his theories had already begun to lose popularity. French Polonophilia had also lost momentum, especially in conservative and liberal circles horrified by the spectre of a recurring *Commune* and the linking of the Polish problem with political and social radicalism.[95] The affinity of ideas held by both anthropologists became less noticeable as the number of people familiar with Duchiński's work dwindled. However, this does not mean that the extent to which Quatrefages's work was indebted to Duchiński's ideas went completely unnoticed. At the beginning of 1873 the London *Pall Mall Gazette* — a liberal-leaning newspaper — offered in its editorial a mocking criticism of a plan to organize an expedition to search for the ten lost tribes of Israel, which recalled Duchiński's view that the Moscow Turans are a Semitic people. The acceptance of this view — written ironically by the author of the article — leads logically to the conclusion that this expedition should set out for Russia. For the reader who had never heard of Duchiński the editorial added a short note: 'Duchiński, the polemical ethnologist of Russia and Poland (from whose arsenal that inferior warrior M. Quatrefages has borrowed the weapons he employs against "la race Prussienne")'.[96]

The reception of 'La Race prussienne' also played a part in Quatrefages's intellectual indebtedness to Duchiński disappearing into oblivion. Quite naturally, Quatrefages' work attracted mainly the interest of French and Prussian scholars for whom the question of the range of Slavic settlements in the east was clearly of secondary importance. They focused their attention on the population inhabiting the Baltic coast. In France there appeared a great number of authors who followed in Quatrefages's footsteps, trying to prove, like Louis Figuier, that the same cruelty which once characterized Finns now characterized modern Prussians in whom it had simply been brought back to life.[97] Racial theories became one of the more

[94] Quatrefages, 'La Race prusienne', p. 649.

[95] Ernst Birke, *Frankreich und Ostmitteleuropa im 19. Jahrhundert. Beiträge zur Politik und Geistesgeschichte*, Cologne, 1960, pp. 366–67.

[96] *The Ten Tribes*, quotation from the *Evening Post* (Wellington, NZ) 8, 1 February 1873, 308, p. 2.

[97] Louis Figuier, *Tableau de la nature. Les races humaines*, Paris, 1872; see Poliakov, *Der arische Mythos*, p. 295.

interesting currents of French nationalism.[98] On the other hand, the Reich relied on the same arguments for demonstrating the close ties connecting the annexed provinces (Alsace and Lorraine) with Germany.[99]

On 14 October 1871, during the proceedings of the German Anthropological Society, a geographer and cartographer, Heinrich Kiepert, presented Quatrefages's main theses. Those present at the meeting did not try to conceal their indignation at what they heard.[100] The reaction of Rudolf Virchow, a co-founder of the Society, was more restrained but at the same time more practical. During one of the later meetings of the Society he told the members the information he had received from the Swedish anthropologist of Helsingfors (Helsinki), Otton Hjelt. The latter, however confirming Duchiński's thesis about Finns' vengefulness, denied that they showed a propensity for treason or cruelty.[101] In September 1873 Virchow informed the Society of the plans for taking anthropological measurements of German students (he deplored that the Prussian army had refused to give consent to carry out this operation among German recruits). This anthropological 'scrutiny' finally encompassed several million people.[102] At the same time he sent an official request to the Russian authorities for their consent to carry out similar research in Finland. Both these great research projects, as he explained, were to serve the purpose of verifying Quatrefages's theses:

> Gentlemen, you know that the French conflict has fostered the belief that central Europe is inhabited by two categories of people. The first consists of the descendants of the ancient population of the area. Slightly built, they have dark eyes, dark hair, and in varying degrees dark skin, and are

[98] Susanne Michl, *Im Dienste des 'Volkskörpers'. Deutsche und französische Ärzte im Ersten Weltkrieg*, Göttingen, 2007, pp. 60–63; Gonthier-Louis Fink, 'Der janusköpfige Nachbar. Das französische Deutschlandbild gestern und heute', in *Fiktion des Fremden. Erkundung kultureller Grenzen in Literatur und Publizistik*, ed. Dietrich Harth, Frankfurt am Main, 1994, pp. 21–56; Heidi Mehrkens, *Statuswechsel. Kriegserfahrung und nationale Wahrnehmung im Deutsch-Französischen Krieg 1870/71*, Essen, 2008, passim. For a more detailed analysis of this aspect of racial discourse in France see Carole Reynaud-Paligot, *La République raciale. Paradigme racial et idéologie républicaine (1860–1930)*, Paris, 2006.

[99] Wolfgang Freund, 'Disputierte Bevölkerung. Der gelehrte Streit um die Menschen an der deutsch-französischen Grenze', in *Bevölkerungsfragen. Prozesse des Wissenstransfers in Deutschland und Frankreich (1870–1939)*, ed. by Patrick Krassnitzer and Petra Overath, Cologne, 2007, pp. 210–15.

[100] 'Sitzungen der Localvereine', *Correspondenz-Blatt der deutschen Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte*, 1871, 11, p. 83.

[101] 'Sitzungsberichte der Localvereine', *Correspondenz-Blatt der deutschen Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte*, 1872, 5, p. 33.

[102] See Paul Weindling, *Health, Race and German Politics Between National Unification and Nazism, 1870–1945*, Cambridge, 1989, pp. 48–49.

> now known as the Finnic or Estonian race. [...] The second comprises those who arrived here later and who — representing the Aryan race — are believed to be very tall, strong-built, and possessed of blue eyes and pale skin. Thus in the eyes of our western colleagues, there is really no point in trying to distinguish between Celts, Germans, and Slavs. An Aryan is supposed to have blue eyes and blond hair. He must be tall, strong, and of pale complexion.[103]

The anthropological survey yielded results which entirely disproved Quatrefages's theses. The operation of measuring students' physical build demonstrated that anthropological traits usually attributed to Aryans typified the inhabitants of Prussia, being particularly prevalent among those who lived along the Baltic coast. In 1874, upon his return from Finland, Virchow stated that in that country — just like in the rest of Europe — one could find both long and short skull types. Moreover, he made a claim that in anthropological terms the population of Finland differed little from that of Russia. This in turn led him to form the opinion that 'relying on anthropology is clearly a flawed strategy to be employed by Panslavism in searching for its own legitimacy'.[104] He concluded his speech with a statement which in his opinion also put an end to the whole debate. 'We are not in a position to state beyond any doubt whether any of the tribes of central Europe is Indo-European or Finnish'.[105]

As is well-known, the impression that empirical research managed to close the discussion of the racial problem in central Europe proved false.

---

[103] 'Sie wissen, dass gerade durch den französischen Streit die Meinung in der Vordergrund getreten ist, dass es auf dem Gebiete des mittleren Europas zwei Kategorien von Bevölkerungen gebe, nämlich eine uralte Aboriginerbevölkerung, welche sich vorzugsweise durch kleineren und schwächeren Körperbau, durch dunkle Farbe der Augen und des Haares, sowie zum Theile auch der Haut auszeichnen soll und welche die finnischen oder der estnischen [...] Rasse zugerechnet wird, und eine arische Einwanderung [...], von der man [...] behauptet, dass sie gross, sogar sehr gross, blond, blauäugig, hellfarbig und stark gewesen sei. Das Celtische, Germanische oder Slawische erscheint in diesem Augenblicke den Augen unserer westlichen Collegen gleichgültig; ist jemand arisch, so muss er blauäugig, blond, gross, stark und hellfarbig sein', Rudolf Virchow, [contribution to the discussion], in *Die vierte allgemeine Versammlung der deutschen Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte zu Wiesbaden am 15. bis 17. September 1873*, ed. Alexander von Frantzius, Braunschweig, 1874, p. 28.

[104] 'Wenn also der Panslawismus im Augenblicke vom anthropologischen Standpunkte aus sich construiren will, so hat das seine misslichen Seiten', Rudolf Virchow, 'Über die Verbreitung brachycephaler Schädel in vorgeschichtlicher und geschichtlicher Zeit in Deutschland', in *Die fünfte allgemeine Versammlung der deutschen Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte zu Dresden vom 14. bis 16. September 1874*, ed. Hermann von Ihering, Braunschweig, 1875, p. 14.

[105] 'Das ist also unzweifelhaft, dass wir nicht in der Lage sind, einfach zu sagen, es sei ein Volk oder ein Volksstam in Mitteleuropa indogermanisch oder finnisch', ibid., p. 15.

In the following decades the 'Aryan myth' and Nordic theory gained much popularity in Germany. The question of Indo-Germans became a political one, with Indo-Germans being usually identified with Germans. It is this process that has been particularly well explored by historians involved in the study of the history of ideas.[106]

The *histoire croisée* of scholarly disciplines as understood by Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann sets itself the task of revealing the network of connections between different fields of study and between different national contexts. Such an approach encourages attempts to go beyond old interpretative patterns.[107] In the above, we have combined different aspects of three traditional research strategies. One of these approaches is connected with studies in the history of historiography inaugurated in Poland by such scholars as Marian Henryk Serejski and Andrzej Feliks Grabski and presently continued by Andrzej Wierzbicki. Issues addressed by such scholars step outside 'pure' historiography, venturing into the realm of the historical imagination characterizing past societies. With boundaries of the discipline thus circumscribed, Franciszek Duchiński in his capacity as a philosopher of history remains 'naturally' within the focus of its interest. On the other hand, racial theories lie within the framework of nationalistic discourse, thus attracting the attention of historians of nationalism — in so far as Quatrefages is concerned, it is of course especially French and German nationalisms.[108] Last but not least, the Franco-German 'war of professors' makes up part of the story of European racism. The role of Quatrefages in this was crucial, while that of Duchiński was marginal.

A matter of secondary importance for Polish historiography is that Duchiński's ideas not only found a number of followers, but that they also inspired an analogous theory put forth by Quatrefages. Directed against Russia, Duchiński's theory which linked the anthropological origin of the Muscovites with a Turan race was used by the French scholar who 'shifted' it in space and applied it to Prussians. Quatrefages drew on more than one

[106] Among the great body of literature on the problem one can confine oneself to mentioning some classic studies: Georg L. Mosse, *The Crisis of German Ideology: Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich*, London, 1964; Peter Weingart, Jürgen Kroll and Kurt Bayertz, *Rasse, Blut und Gene. Geschichte der Eugenik und Rassenhygiene in Deutschland*, Frankfurt am Main, 1988. The institutional development of German studies on race was summarized in an encyclopedic form in *Handbuch der völkischen Wissenschaften. Personen, Institutionen, Forschungsprogramme, Stiftungen*, ed. Ingo Haar, Michael Fahlbusch and Matthias Berg, Munich, 2008.

[107] Werner and Zimmermann, 'Beyond Comparison', p. 49.

[108] See Cordula Tollmien, 'Der "Krieg der Geister" in der Provinz — das Beispiel der Universität Göttingen 1914–1919', *Göttinger Jahrbuch*, 41, 1993, pp. 180–210.

strand of Duchiński's argument, preserving, at least implicitly, its anti-Russian character. For Virchow, who passed a devastating criticism of the theory, it was still easy to recognize the connection between the view indicating the Finnish origin of Prussians and that concerning the ethnoghenesis of Russians. The later reception of Quatrefages's work became increasingly isolated from the thesis postulated by Duchiński. European racists were no longer interested in the ideas of the Polish emigrant. Serious ethnologists or anthropologist felt no need to study the origins of the views they criticized. For the latter it was unacceptable to liken any academic discipline to armies sent into battle with a view to fighting the enemy of the fatherland. The weekly *Nature*, in the third year of its publication, commented on this in the following way: 'We think an ethnological journal is not the place for international warfare'.[109]

(Translated by Artur Mękarski)

Summary

This article by Maciej Górny discusses the works of two nineteenth-century anthropologists: Franciszek Duchiński (1816–93) and Jean-Louis Armand de Quatrefages de Bréau (1810–92). The methodological foundation of the text is the conception of *histoire croisée*. The first of the above-mentioned scholars was a Polish political émigré born in Ukraine and living in Turkey, France and Switzerland, the author of a theory about the non-Slavonic racial origin of the Russians. In the 1860s and 1870s his theses became widely known in France and German-speaking countries. Quatrefages became acclaimed for his publication *La Race prussienne*, maintaining that the Prussians are of Turan (Mongol) origin. The topic of the discussed article also embraces the international reception of both authors: Jean-Louis Quatrefages has been assigned a place both in the history of science and in works on the history of European racism, while Franciszek Duchiński has been relegated to the margin of Polish and Ukrainian history of historiography.

Maciej Górny conducted a comparative analysis of the theses propounded by the two authors. Consequently, and upon the basis of assorted evidence documenting contacts maintained by Quatrefages and Duchiński we might assert that *La race prussienne* was in part plagiarism of the publication by the Polish-Ukrainian anthropologist and partly an adaptation of his theses to slightly different research material.

(Translated by Aleksandra Rodzińska-Chojnowska)

[109] 'Scientific serials', *Nature*, 30 May 1872, p. 93.

Kwartalnik Historyczny
Vol. CXXI, 2014
Special Issue, pp. 123–141
PL ISSN 0023-5903

PAWEŁ DUBER
Muzeum Józefa Piłsudskiego w Sulejówku
Warsaw

THE LEADERSHIP OF THE *SANACJA* CAMP AND THE CONTROVERSY OVER THE FUTURE CONSTITUTION, 1928–1935

The coup d'état of May 1926 should be regarded as one of the most important events in the recent history of Poland. The seizure of power by Józef Piłsudski put an end to the period usually referred to as the 'era of parliamentary ascendancy'.[1] One of the main goals of the political camp led by Marshal Piłsudski was to strengthen the executive prerogatives of the president by introducing far-reaching changes to the Constitution of 1921. The camp's leaders also stressed the need to cure all the ills plaguing the country's political life.[2] For this reason, the regime that came to power in 1926 began to be called the '*Sanacja*' (an elusive term best translated as 'moral improvement'). However, it should also be remembered that Piłsudski, in seizing almost complete control of Polish political life, did not have a clear-cut programme for rebuilding the foundations of political system. Work on this programme, undertaken long before the May Coup, continued for many years, revealing serious divergences of opinion among the Marshal's close associates. The most significant conflicts involved the attempts to give a new shape to the upper house of parliament, to determine the mutual relations between

[1] Janusz Pajewski, *Budowa Drugiej Rzeczypospolitej 1918–1926*, Kraków, 1995, p. 199. A historian known for being a Piłsudski adherent went so far as to use the term 'the period of the Sejm's omnipotence'. See Władysław Pobóg-Malinowski, *Najnowsza historia polityczna Polski*, 3 vols, Gdańsk, 1990, vol. 2: *1914–1939*, p. 579.

[2] For more on the problem see Andrzej Friszke, *O kształt niepodległej*, Warsaw, 1989, pp. 227–29; Andrzej Garlicki, *Od maja do Brześcia*, Warsaw, 1981, p. 150. Among more recent works see Waldemar Paruch, *Myśl polityczna obozu piłsudczykowskiego 1926–1939*, Lublin, 2005, pp. 211–15.

the executive and legislative branch of the state, and to elaborate the procedure for the election of the president.

It is possible to distinguish two phases in the controversy which, while concerning the new constitution, divided Piłsudski's adherents. The first, covering the period 1928–30, is connected with the rivalry between Kazimierz Bartel, five-times prime minister during the *Sanacja* era, and a group of Piłsudski's close associates called the 'Colonels'. The latter have often been perceived as the most authoritarian branch of the *Sanacja* camp. They were in charge of the Non-Party Block for Cooperation with the Government (BBWR) — a pro-government organization brought into being shortly before parliamentary elections held in 1928.[3]

The conflict in question has already been covered by historians,[4] but these authors have rarely focused their attention on the constitutional dimension of the problem.[5] The second stage of the controversy came in the years 1931–35 and concerned the debates that culminated in the enactment of the April 1935 Constitution. The debates revealed a substantial disagreement among the 'Colonels'. However, it was only after Piłsudski's death on 12 May 1935 that this controversy became conspicuous. The Marshal's death, which came soon after he put his signature to the new constitution, forms the closing caesura of this article. It is also worth noting that the focus here is only on those who, in addition

[3] The author of a monograph on the political concepts of Piłsudski's supporters introduced a distinction between a 'group' and a 'circle' of Colonels. Among the former he included Walery Sławek, Kazimierz Świtalski, Janusz Jędrzejewicz and Aleksander Prystor. The 'circle' comprised all those who in the years 1930–35 were close to the circle of Colonels and played some role in political life of the *Sanacja* regime. Władysław T. Kulesza, *Koncepcje ideowo-polityczne obozu rządzącego w Polsce w latach 1926–1935*, Wrocław, 1985, p. 118.

[4] Andrzej Ajnenkiel, *Polska po przewrocie majowym. Zarys dziejów politycznych Polski 1926–1939*, Warsaw, 1980, pp. 144–45, 174–75; Jerzy Marek Nowakowski, *Walery Sławek (1879–1939). Zarys biografii politycznej*, Warsaw, 1988, pp. 76–77, 93–94; Andrzej Chojnowski, *Piłsudczycy u władzy. Dzieje Bezpartyjnego Bloku Współpracy z Rządem*, Wrocław, 1986, pp. 28–30, 108–09; Andrzej Garlicki, *Piękne lata trzydzieste*, Warsaw, 2008, pp. 82–84; Wiesław Władyka, *Działalność polityczna polskich stronnictw konserwatywnych w latach 1926–1935*, Wrocław, 1977, p. 161; Jan Kęsik, *Zaufany Komendanta. Biografia polityczna Jana Henryka Józewskiego 1892–1981*, Wrocław, 1995, pp. 42–44; Dorota Malczewska-Pawelec, *Bogusław Miedziński (1891–1972). Polityk i publicysta*, Łódź, 2002, p. 165; Marek Sioma, *Sławoj Felicjan Składkowski (1885–1962). Żołnierz i polityk*, Lublin, 2005, pp. 142, 175–76; Andrzej Krawczyk, 'Kazimierz Bartel, premier Rzeczypospolitej 15 V–4 VI 1926, 8 VI–24 IX 1926, 27 IX–30 IX 1926, 27 IV 1928–13 IV 1929, 29 XII 1929–17 III 1930', in *Prezydenci i premierzy Drugiej Rzeczypospolitej*, ed. Andrzej Chojnowski and Piotr Wróbel, Wrocław, 1992, p. 242; Ludwik Malinowski, *Politycy Drugiej Rzeczypospolitej 1918–1939 (służba i życie prywatne)*, 2 vols, Toruń, 1997, vol. 2, p. 13.

[5] There is a rather inadequate discussion of Bartel's political ideas in Kulesza, *Koncepcje ideowo-polityczne*, pp. 72–77.

to being involved in this controversy, worked closely with Piłsudski. We do not take into account other groups within the broadly defined *Sanacja* camp, such as the conservatives or 'Naprawiacze' ('repairers') such as Jerzy Szurig, Wiktor Przedpełski and Tadeusz Katelbach.

In the summer of 1928 the BBWR stepped up its efforts to change the constitution. Following the proposal put forward by Walery Sławek — the BBWR's chairman and one of Piłsudski's closest friends — a special meeting was held with a view to discussing constitutional problems. Apart from politicians representing the *Sanacja* regime, the meeting attracted distinguished lawyers largely connected with conservative circles. Absent from the meeting was Kazimierz Bartel, the then prime minister, which clearly shows that he was not deeply involved in the attempts to modify the constitution.[6] However, given his position, the BBWR's leadership kept Bartel informed of the progress made. Bearing witness to this is a surviving draft of the constitution presented to the Prime Minister for consultation with a note on the first page of the document: 'A copy for Prime Minister Kazimierz Bartel. The draft of the constitution prepared by the BBWR'. The prime minister was also asked to indicate the most significant propositions included in the project. The head of the cabinet must have analysed the draft in detail, for much of the surviving version of the typescript is underlined.[7] This of course is insufficient to form a clear opinion about Bartel's view of the proposed changes. However, there survives another typescript containing general guidelines to be followed in the drawing up of the future constitution. It is neither dated nor signed. For this reason, it is not possible to say with absolute certainty by whom it was drawn up. But it is kept in the files of the Presidium of the Council of Ministers, among the same group of documents as the draft of the constitution prepared by the BBWR and reviewed by Bartel.[8] Taken together, all of this seems to indicate that its author was Bartel himself. That this was the case is above all suggested by the views contained therein.

The first issue dealt with in the document concerns the election of the president. The head of state should be elected for a term of ten years by people of twenty-four years of age and above, who could read Polish. The

---

[6] Compare: Adam Piasecki, *Sprawozdanie z ankiety przygotowawczej do reformy konstytucji odbytej w dniach 30, 31 lipca i 1 sierpnia 1928 r. w Warszawie na zaproszenie pos. płk. Walerego Sławka Prezesa Klubu Bezpartyjnego Bloku Współpracy z Rządem pod przewodnictwem Pos. Prof. Wacława Makowskiego*, Warsaw, 1928.

[7] *Egzemplarz konstytucji, wniesiony przez BBWR pod obrady Sejmu w 1929 r.*, AAN, Prezydium Rady Ministrów, VI, sign. 5-2 II, fols 30–67.

[8] *Zasady Zmiany Konstytucji*, AAN, Prezydium Rady Ministrów, VI, sign. 5-2 II, fols 153–54.

method of carrying out the election was complicated. Each commune was to elect 'primary voters' who, in turn, elected delegates. The latter were to form the National Assembly, which would meet in Warsaw to elect the president. Consisting of 444 deputies, a unicameral parliament was to be elected every five years in general, direct, secret and proportional elections. The right to vote was to be granted to everyone twenty-four years of age and above, while those who wanted to stand in the election had to be at least twenty-eight years old and have completed general education.[9] The author of the project also proposed to create the Council of Laws (*Rada Praw*), to be made up of fifty members who had to be at least thirty--five years of age. They would be elected for a term of five years. Twenty--five members of this body would be appointed by the president from among people 'learned in the law and well-informed about economic life'. Eleven members of the Council would be elected by universities and four by polytechnics. Parliament was supposed to choose the rest — but from outside its own ranks.[10] The fact that presidential nominees made up half of the members of the Council shows clearly that the body was entirely dependent on the head of state. Along this line, the project also proposed to arm the president with a veto by giving him the 'right to hold over the publication of a bill passed by Parliament' when its passage was obtained 'with little or no regard for the opinion expressed by the majority of the Council of Laws'. If the president decided to exercise this right, then within six weeks the bill was referred back to the House where it could be carried through by a majority of eleven out of twenty. After that, the president was obliged to sign the bill into law.[11] According to the project, the government would have a chancellor at its head, nominated for office by the president. The chancellor would be entrusted with the task of forming the cabinet — 'constitutionally accountable to the State Tribunal and parliamentarily accountable to the Sejm'. Interestingly, the Council of Ministers thus formed did not need to gain a seal of approval from parliament. The possibility of dismissing the government by parliament would arise only as a result of 'the rejection of the government's annual report by a majority of 245 deputies (absolute majority)'. The rejection of the government's budget proposal by the same majority was another way to oust the government. Individual ministers would not be held accountable to the sejm. Such accountability was to 'rest either with the chancellor in

[9] Ibid., fol. 153.
[10] Ibid.
[11] Ibid., fol. 154.

his capacity as the main representative of the government or with the government as a whole'.[12]

In reading these proposals, it is difficult to avoid the impression that the arrangements it contains were quite similar to those put forward by conservative circles.[13] However, it was Bartel who proposed these procedures. That seems to be attested to not only by the passage advocating the idea of providing the prime minister with chancellor-like powers, but also by the interview Bartel gave to *Kurier Wileński*, a daily newspaper published in Wilno (Vilnius). This interview was later also published in pamphlet form. In the preface to this publication, Bartel stressed the fact that it should be regarded as expressing a general criticism of the parliamentary system. In his opinion, the system was deeply flawed as it lacked 'organizational sense' and rested on 'contradictory assumptions'.[14] In response to a question regarding the crisis of parliamentarianism in general, he remarked that complaints about the parliamentary system made themselves heard in countries in which such a system was already well-established. This was clearly indicative of the ills from which it suffered. In fact it seemed to have crisis at its very core. On the one hand, the principles underlying it made the formation of the government dependent on a parliamentary majority. On the other hand, parliament's basic role consisted in exercising control over the executive branch of the government. It was then clear that 'the very same parties that, holding a majority in the House of Representatives, are supposed to appoint the government and accept responsibility for its policy, are also supposed to control it. That is obvious nonsense'. This line of reasoning allowed Bartel to arrive at the conclusion that the cabinet should be appointed by the president and not by parliament. In his opinion, the practice prevalent in the period before May 1926 showed that in Poland the legislature had never been able to exercise effective control over the executive.[15] In response to a question about parliament's control of the government, he said:

> the government should be required to present to the Sejm an annual report on the whole of its activity. Such a report can serve as the basis

[12] Ibid.

[13] This is clearly seen in the indirect way of electing the head of state as well as in the idea of establishing the Council of Laws which was supposed to become a kind of the Upper House of Parliament. Compare: Tomasz Sikorski, *'W kręgu państwa i władzy'. Koncepcje ustroju politycznego polskich konserwatystów (1926–1939)*, Toruń, 2007, pp. 120–26, 273–89.

[14] Kazimierz Bartel, *Niedomagania parlamentaryzmu. Wywiad z Prezesem Rady Ministrów Prof. Dr. Kazimierzem Bartlem ogłoszony w Kurierze Wileńskim z dn. 4 października 1928 r.*, Warsaw, 1928, p. 3.

[15] Ibid., pp. 5–7.

> for discussion [...] possessing characteristics of real critique and control. This is an *ex-post* control. [...] The future is to be discussed along with budget proposals which the government is also required to present to Parliament every year. Both discussions ought to be held apart [...].

Bartel accused the deputies of laziness, the source of which, in his opinion, lay in the corrupting principles on which the functioning of both houses of parliament was based. In formulating such a view, he relied, as he himself declared, on his own experience of parliamentary life.[16] He did not rule out the possibility of parliament dismissing the government. He added, however, that this

> cannot be done in an irresponsible and insouciant way. The government which seriously treats its duties cannot become a plaything in the hands of political parties putting their own particular interests ahead of the vital interests of the whole state.

He unambiguously declared himself in favour of a 'chancellor system' in which the head of the government was appointed by, and answerable to, the head of state. The prime minister should also be given the freedom to choose individual ministers, none of whom, however, should be held accountable for the policy carried out by the government as a whole. Bartel also argued for an increase in the voting age from twenty-four to twenty-five.[17]

It is not difficult to see that the views articulated in the publication under discussion and the document mentioned previously are very similar. Noteworthy here is not only the fact that the head of government was supposed to exercise chancellor-like powers, but also that he depended on the president for his nomination.[18] Also worth mentioning is the question of parliamentary control of the government. Both the typescript providing the outline of the potential political system, and the interview for *Kurier Wileński* propose to deal with the problem in an almost identical way: both require the premier-chancellor to present an annual report on the government's activity. It is on this occasion that parliament is to be given a chance to oust the prime minister from office. Another opportunity to deprive the chief of government his power would arise only during a budget debate. Moreover, both the typescript and the interview contain a suggestion to raise the voting

[16] Ibid., pp. 7–8.

[17] Ibid., pp. 8–10.

[18] Bartel referred to this issue also in 1933 in an interview with *Bunt Młodych*. In his opinion, such a solution was the best way in which to make the government work properly. 'Wywiad z Profesorem Kazimierzem Bartlem', *Bunt Młodych*, 1933, 38, p. 5.

age from twenty-four to twenty-five. It can therefore be argued that in the interview in question, Bartel offered some general ideas on how to reform the political system. These ideas were presented in more detail in the typescript dealt with here, whether this was an earlier or a later document. It is interesting to note that the interview says nothing about establishing a Council of Laws. Bartel may have thought that it was too early to reveal this idea. He must have been aware of the fact that, while falling outside the framework of a classical form of parliamentary democracy, it was likely to elicit a critical reaction. Quite paradoxically, in imposing limitations on the legislature, his proposals went even further than those prepared by the BBWR and brought before parliament for debate.[19] The BBWR's programme proposed to elect the president in a general election, granting the right to vote to everyone over twenty-four years of age, without, however, mentioning anything about the ability to read and write in Polish. The president was to be elected from two candidates — one suggested by the outgoing president and one proposed by both houses of parliament. While in agreement with Bartel's proposal in its suggestion to raise the voting age, the BBWR's proposals said nothing of the establishment of the Council of Laws dependent on the head of state. In contrast, Bartel proposed to create such an institution, half of whom were to be presidential nominees and, consequently, dependent on the president. The remaining members of the Council were to be appointed in a way that deprived citizens of any influence on its composition. Such a solution needs to be regarded as radically elitist. Its adoption may have been influenced by the fact that Bartel, a distinguished scholar connected with university circles, naturally wanted to reserve an important role for them. In the BBWR's programme the right to run for office was to be given to those of at least thirty years of age. Bartel wanted to lower this threshold by two years. However, he suggested a condition that those who wished to stand for election were required to have an elementary education — a condition which, given the realities of interwar Poland, may have been too difficult for many to fulfil. Also surprising is the extent to which Bartel wanted to restrict the legislature's traditional control of the executive. Allowed to evaluate the government's work only twice annually, the former actually lost control of the latter for the majority of the year. The BBWR's project offered no solution to this problem.

[19] For more on the project see: 'Wniosek posła Walerego Sławka i kolegów z Klubu Bezpartyjnego Bloku Współpracy z Rządem w sprawie zmiany niektórych postanowień Ustawy Konstytucyjnej w trybie, przewidzianym dla jej rewizji', Sejm RP, Okres II, druk nr 444; Wacław Komarnicki, *Ustrój państwowy Polski współczesnej. Geneza i system*, Kraków, 2006, pp. 96–109.

Instead, it only tightened the procedure used in the submission of a motion of no confidence against the government. The acceptance of the proposals put forward by Bartel had to result in the establishment of a duumvirate comprising the prime minister and the president, therefore leaving the opposition unable to exercise any influence on Polish political life. Thus the proposals offered by the Bartel, who was considered as a liberal, can be seen as even more authoritarian than those put forward by the BBWR.[20]

These concepts did not meet with the 'Colonels'' approval. This much is evident from the conversation Kazimierz Świątalski — one of the leading politicians within this group — held with Wacław Bitner on 24 November 1929, that is, many months later. The conversation concerned possible ways of reforming the Polish political system. In referring to the possibility of establishing the chancellor system of government, Świtalski said that in his opinion

> The Polish psyche makes it difficult to reconcile the position of the president [...] with one occupied by someone else who would be a real ruler — and such would be the position of this premier-chancellor. The Polish psyche makes it necessary for power to be symbolically perceived by the people as united in one man. It cannot be divided between two persons.[21]

Given this opinion, it is hardly surprising that Bartel's proposals were left out of the project prepared by the BBWRs leadership. Bartel seems to have been offended by the omission.[22]

However, this failure did not discourage him from attempting to push through his reforms in defiance of the position adopted by the 'Colonels'. At the beginning of 1930, a few days after being reinstalled

[20] It is worth considering how far Bartel himself can be given credit for elaborating these concepts, and how far their elaboration can be ascribed to the influence of different theoreticians dealing with political systems. It is hard to resolve the issue unequivocally. However, there is no doubt that the idea of making the position of the head of the government strong and answerable to the president had appeared earlier. This is indicated by K. Korczewski's publication of 1926 in the pages of *Droga*. See: K. Korczewski, 'O stanowisko władzy w Polsce', *Droga*, 1926, 8, pp. 631–40. The proposals contained in the publication correspond with those put forward by Bartel in his constitutional reforms.

[21] Kazimierz Świtalski, *Diariusz. Uzupełnienie z lat 1919–1932*, Warszawa 2012, p. 96.

[22] Kazimierz Świtalski, *Diariusz 1919–1935*, Warsaw, 1992, s. 366. Analysing Bartel's proposals, it is difficult to agree with the opinion expressed by Władysław Sikorski who in a letter to Ignacy Paderewski called them compromising or conciliatory, saying that they were rejected as 'insufficient'. See: *Archiwum polityczne Ignacego Paderewskiego*, 5 vols, Wrocław and Warsaw, 1973–2001, vol. 3, ed. Halina Janowska and Czesław Madajczyk, 1974, p. 147.

as prime minister, he discussed the question with Prince Janusz Radziwiłł, informing him that the government had not yet prepared the constitutional reform programme.[23] On 11 January 1930 he appeared at the meeting of parliament's Constitution Committee in order to show that he was interested in constitutional problems.[24] There is evidence to suggest that his appearance there was not merely an insignificant or propagandistic gesture. In giving an account of the meeting, Stanisław Cat-Mackiewicz made it clear that the leadership of the *Sanacja* camp had produced two plans for constitutional reform. According to Cat's account, Feliks Dutkiewicz, the minister of justice, was to say that both 'his and Bartel's views on the changes to be introduced in the constitution differ from those held by the BBWR's members engaged in the task of carrying out its revision.' However, 'the opposition betrayed no willingness to favour either Colonel Sławek's proposal or that of Premier Bartel'.[25] Moreover, on 11 March 1930 the head of the government decided to set up a special committee made up of constitutional experts. Its first meeting was to take place a week later.[26] Andrzej Chojnowski is correct both in pointing to Bartel's conversation with Radziwiłł and claiming that the former entertained the idea of introducing his own bill of constitutional amendments.[27] It is hardly surprising then that during the meeting of the Preservation Committee (*Komitet Zachowawczy*) Radziwiłł informed those in attendance of serious conflicts within the *Sanacja* leadership. In recounting his conversation with

[23] Bogusław Gałka, *Ziemianie w parlamencie II Rzeczypospolitej*, Toruń, 2000, p. 99.

[24] 'Rozpoczęcie pracy nad rewizją konstytucji. Pierwsze dwa głosy w debacie na komisji konstytucyjnej', *Gazeta Polska*, no. 11, 12 I 1930, p. 2; Stanisław Mackiewicz, 'Czterdzieści jeden posiedzeń Komisji Konstytucyjnej', *Przegląd Współczesny*, 37, 1931, pp. 76–77. See also: idem, *Historia Polski od 11 listopada 1918 r. do 5 lipca 1945 r.*, London, s.a., p. 203. During the meeting of the Constitution Committee the deputy Mieczysław Niedziałkowski delivered a paper expressing the following opinion: 'The Prime Minister Bartel advocates a "chancellor system". In a way we already had such a system in Poland. Władysław Grabski was such a kind of a chancellor and it is difficult to imagine that a prime minister can hold a greater power over his ministers than that which, although ungrounded in the constitution, was held by Grabski', *Mieczysław Niedziałkowski o demokracji i parlamentaryzmie*, ed. Michał Śliwa, Warsaw, 1996, p. 145.

[25] Mackiewicz, 'Czterdzieści jeden posiedzeń', pp. 76–77.

[26] The committee comprised the following: Zygmunt Cybichowski, Antoni Peretiatkowicz, Michał Rostworowski, Jan Kopczyński, Władysław Kuczyński and Jan Kanty Piętak. *Koncept pisma z 11 marca 1930 r. informującego o powołaniu Komisji rzeczoznawców konstytucyjnych oraz mianowaniu jej członków*, AAN, Prezydium Rady Ministrów, VI, sign. 5-2 I, fols 13, 18. The decision to set up the committee was made personally by the prime minister a few days earlier. Those who sat on the committee were supposed to express opinions on 'political issues relating to the revision of the constitution' See: 'Z Prezydium Rady Ministrów', *Monitor Polski*, no. 60, 13 March 1929, p. 2.

[27] Chojnowski, *Piłsudczycy u władzy*, pp. 148–49.

Piłsudski, he said that he was under the impression that 'when it comes to the relations with the sejm it is Colonel Sławek and not Bartel who enjoys the Marshal's confidence'. For Sławek, unlike Bartel, 'is prepared to strictly follow Piłsudski's instructions'.[28] This opinion explains why political concepts promoted by Bartel, five-times prime minister, could never materialize. He lacked sufficient political support to implement them. In the first place, of course, Bartel's proposals failed to gain acceptance from Piłsudski who remained the most important decision maker in Poland's post-May political landscape.

Bartel, after resigning in March 1930, was never again appointed to any important position. In the autumn of the same year, following the government's crackdown on the opposition and the victorious elections in which the BBWR won the majority of seats in both houses of parliament, it was the 'Colonels' who began to dominate the political life of the Second Republic. Unsurprisingly, it was their project, brought before parliament in unaltered form on 6 February 1931, which became the basis for further efforts to reform the political system.[29] Soon the programme was referred to the parliamentary committee that began work on the new constitution.[30] This work ran parallel to that carried out in the circle of Piłsudski's close associates who, as it turned out, were divided on how to reform the political system in Poland. The divisions within the group are reflected in the discussions that took place during the conference on constitutional issues called by Sławek on 20 June 1932. Lasting a few days, the conference was attended by leading representatives of the 'Colonels' group, as well as by other people connected with it. It is advisable to take a closer look at those discussions. They show that as early as 1931 the leading members of the group in question were deeply divided on a variety of issues concerning Poland's political system.

The conference dealt mainly with the method of electing the president. Stanisław Car was the first to address the meeting. He came up with the idea of a 'limited plebiscite'. It would consist of voting for one of the two candidates — one appointed by the National Assembly and one proposed by the outgoing president. However, Car argued that even such a plebiscite might be either 'unnecessary or undesirable' and that is why it should not be made an obligatory form of electing the head of state.

[28] 'Projekt protokołu posiedzenia Komitetu Zachowawczego w dniu 7 marca 1930', State Archive in Kraków (APK), Archiwum Dzikowskich z Tarnowa, sign. 700, fol. 123.

[29] Sprawozdanie stenograficzne z 10 posiedzenia Sejmu, 6 II 1931, Ł. X/53; 'Wniosek posłów z Klubu Bezpartyjnego Bloku Współpracy z Rządem z 6 lutego 1931 roku w sprawie zmiany Konstytucji', Sejm RP, Okres III, druk nr 111.

[30] Chojnowski, *Piłsudczycy u władzy*, pp. 188–89.

The decision to hold a plebiscite was to be left to the outgoing president. Among other proposals concerning the election of the president was that put forward by Adam Skwarczyński. In his opinion, the president should be elected by the Assembly of Electors which one might liken to a conclave. The idea of a plebiscite-like election also failed to gain the support of Ignacy Matuszewski. However, Matuszewski contended that a compromise version put forward by Car seemed best suited to Poland's specific conditions. The meeting was also addressed by Świtalski who, unlike those who spoke before him, opted for general elections. In his opinion, the president, when elected by popular vote, 'receives a moral legitimacy that allows him to claim that his authority is derived directly from the will of the people'. He was of the opinion that with nominations for public office it was well-advised to defer to 'the instinct of the masses' which, although it could misjudge someone's intellectual ability, was unlikely to be mistaken in evaluating someone's moral value. He also added that it was necessary to sustain this form of election in order to avoid coup d'états and political upheavals. Consequently, he came out against the proposals presented by Skwarczyński. Skwarczyński's electors, he argued, are likely to turn out 'to be the same representatives of the people, put forward by politicians, who usually end up embroiled in a maelstrom of intrigue'. This, he remarked, was likely to be followed by charges of electoral malpractice. As a result, the president, perceived as 'having been chosen by a "clique", would suffer serious damage to his reputation. Sławek in turn, while postponing the discussion of this problem until the next meeting, asked those in attendance to consider the idea of having 'the president elected by other candidates for presidency, those who will manage to get a given amount of the national vote'.[31]

Talks about the election of the president continued on the following day. Wojciech Stpiczyński voiced fears that the procedure suggested by Car would be likely to result in the 'emergence of two kinds of president: one chosen by plebiscite and one elected by the National Assembly. This in turn was likely to have the effect of undermining the authority of the president of the second kind'. The idea of electing the president by popular vote was definitely rejected by Janusz Jędrzejewicz, Skwarczyński, and Jan Piłsudski. Most participants at the conference supported the proposals put forward

[31] 'Protokół nr 1 konferencji u Prezesa Płk. Sławka w dn. 20 czerwca 1932 r. w sprawie zmiany Konstytucji', AAN, BBWR, sign. 77, fols 18–20. In light of the discussion it is difficult to understand the opinion expressed by Janusz Faryś, claiming that Piłsudski's supporters, while clearly advocating the idea of strengthening the prerogatives of the president, maintained that the head of state should be elected by popular vote. Janusz Faryś, *Piłsudski i piłsudczycy. Z dziejów koncepcji polityczno-ustrojowej (1918–1939)*, Szczecin, 1991, p. 106.

by Car. Some, for example Tadeusz Schaetzel, advocated a modification of Car's proposals presented by Wacław Makowski. Makowski, to even a greater extent than Car, made the conduct of a plebiscite dependent on the decision of the outgoing president. A modified version of Car's proposals was as follows:

> The National Assembly elects the president of the Polish Republic by an absolute majority of its votes. If the outgoing president refuses to accept this choice, he puts forward his own candidate and then the next president is to be elected from among the two candidates by means of plebiscite.

However, Świtalski decided to support the earlier version of this project, finding it flexible and 'well suited to Polish conditions'. At the same time, unwilling to believe in the possibility of recruiting real elites, he called the programme presented by Skwarczyński a 'lottery'. The discussion was traditionally concluded by Sławek who posed a surprising question. He asked others whether — leaving aside the present circumstances in which such a solution was ruled out — one should not consider the idea of establishing in Poland a monarchy.[32]

The question of how to elect the president was also dealt with on 22 June 1932. In referring to the question put by Sławek the previous day, Stpiczyński said that, given the existing circumstances, the establishment of a monarchy would encounter serious difficulties. But he added that he would not be opposed to the idea of introducing a lifetime presidency, with each outgoing president designating his successor. However, this idea could be implemented only on the condition that Piłsudski was the first to take the office. He also did not reject the proposal brought forward by Makowski. But the latter's proposal, argued Stpiczyński, could only be implemented if Piłsudski refused to take the office. The idea of establishing a monarchy elicited no positive response from the meeting. Bohdan Podoski and Leon Kozłowski were the only people willing to take it into consideration. Podoski said that 'the Republic has failed to fulfil hopes set on it'. It was rejected by Bolesław Wieniawa-Długoszowski, Edward Rydz-Śmigły, Schaetzel, Matuszewski and Świtalski. Świtalski observed that in

[32] 'Protokół nr 2 konferencji u Prezesa Płk. Sławka w dn. 21 czerwca 1932 r. w sprawie zmiany Konstytucji', AAN, BBWR, 77, fols 21–26. Some historians argue that Sławek actually considered the possibility of introducing such a system in Poland. See Jan Borkowski, 'Piłsudczykowska koncepcja państwa', *DN*, 14, 1982, 1–4, p. 110. However, it seems that one should not attach too great an importance to such declarations. The conference dealing with constitutional issues clearly shows that the BBWR's head considered this idea in theoretical terms only.

Poland 'monarchy could rest only on the support of the army and the peasantry. The latter, however, are not too reliable as the situation in Spain clearly shows'. In his opinion, the introduction of a monarchy was likely to result in the undermining of the strength of the executive, since it was difficult to imagine that the monarch might be granted greater powers than those conferred on the president. It is also worth noting that Świtalski, unlike others, endorsed Car's original proposal, rejecting Makowski's modifications. Consequently, more than any other participant at the conference, he took into account the possibility of electing the president by popular vote. It was Car who concluded the discussion by observing that the form of government is of secondary importance, for both monarchy and republic need to be based on a strong executive.[33]

Another meeting, held on 24 June 1932, was devoted to the election of senators and to the prerogatives they should be granted. A point of departure for the discussion was again provided by Car who declared himself against transforming the senate into a 'chamber of professions' or a 'chamber of commerce'. Instead, while proposing to leave intact the legal procedure used in the election of the upper house of the Polish parliament, he came up with the idea of fifty-five presidential nominees who were supposed to join the existing group of 111 senators. The senate, armed with the right of legislative initiative, 'should also be given more power in the field of enacting new laws'. This proposal met with a negative response and the only person prepared to support it was Matuszewski, in spite of the fact that, in his opinion, it gave no guarantee that a parliamentary majority would be formed by deputies of Polish nationality. It was also clear that the position of the senators to be nominated by the president was inherently weak. Therefore, Matuszewski proposed to increase the number of senators and extend the term of presidential nominees to fifteen years. However, most voiced the opinion that the senate should clearly distinguish itself from the lower house both in the procedure used in the election of its members as well as in the extent of its powers. Many stressed the need to reserve some senate seats for — besides presidential nominees — representatives of local government. An interesting idea was presented by Makowski who opted for dividing the senate into three committees, including a legal one, with senators recruited from experts in various fields. Against this background stood out the proposals offered by Świtalski who saw the senate as an 'anachronism remaining from the period of the battles waged in the name of the people's rights, the result of tradition and

[33] 'Protokół nr 3 konferencji u Prezesa Płk. Sławka w dn. 22 czerwca 1932 r. w sprawie zmiany Konstytucji', AAN, BBWR, sign. 77, fols 27–30.

political rhetoric'. The only advantage of having a senate lay, in his opinion, in the fact that it 'entails technical breaks in the legislative process, thus making the work of the government sometimes easier'. He also expressed a distrust of nominees, since 'in difficult situations they are the first to fail'. In fact, he argued against any experiments in this field, stressing the fact that the 'idea of transforming the senate into a chamber of professions, although in fashion, has nowhere been tried out'.[34]

The discussion concerning the upper house of parliament was continued three days later, on 27 June. Noteworthy is the opinion articulated by Podoski who, while presenting the problem against a wide historical background, found the transformation of the senate into a chamber of professions impossible to realize. In the discussion, an opposing view was offered by Stpiczyński, Makowski defended his own project, which he had presented during the previous meeting, and Świtalski decided to endorse Car's proposal, convinced that — in comparison with other projects — it entailed the smallest changes in the present system. He also supported Podoski when he observed that the transformation of the senate into a chamber of professions would force the authors of the new constitution to put it on an equal footing with the lower house. This, however, was not advisable, since these 'professional experts have never received a parliamentary education which allows one to develop a skill of reaching acceptable compromises'. He also noted that Makowski's proposal was likely to turn the senate into an 'arena of intellectual showmanship which — because of the diversity of its composition — would be either unable, just like a chamber of professions, to do any good work or, just like the present Senate, would break up into political clubs'. In conclusion, Świtalski observed that the adoption of the new constitution was needed to strengthen the executive, and the transformation of one of the houses of parliament into a chamber of professions would be a step in the opposite direction. Car's proposals also gained approval from the Marshal's brother, Jan Piłsudski.[35]

This brief discussion of the debate shows that the search for the best form of political system engendered a great variety of plans and ideas. It

[34] 'Protokół nr 4 konferencji u Prezesa Płk Sławka w dn. 24 czerwca 1932 r. w sprawie zmiany Konstytucji', AAN, BBWR, sign. 77, fols 31–36. Świtalski's opinions on the senate were not shared by Marshal Piłsudski's other followers who opted for maintaining a bicameral parliament. See: Waldemar Paruch, 'Parlament w państwie autorytarnym. Rozważania o myśli politycznej Józefa Piłsudskiego (1926–1935)', in *Józef Piłsudski a parlamentaryzm polski*, ed. Arkadiusz Adamczyk, Warsaw and Bełchatów, 2009, pp. 21–24.

[35] 'Protokół nr 5 konferencji u Prezesa Płk Sławka w dn. 27 czerwca 1932 r. w sprawie zmiany Konstytucji', AAN, BBWR, sign. 77, fols 37–40.

needs to be remembered that it was not conducted in isolation from tendencies across Europe to abandon democratic processes. Furthermore, Piłsudski's supporters, involved in the elaboration of a new political system, came under the influence of conservative circles whose political outlook was inspired by Italian fascism.[36] However, one should also remember that these attempts at constitutional reform aimed to create a Polish variant of authoritarianism — one congruent with the political reality of the Second Republic.[37] The analysis of the problem leads one to draw other notable conclusions. For instance, the 'Colonels', although often portrayed as holding similar views on how to run the government, were actually divided on a variety of important issues.

Interesting conclusions were also drawn from the conference by Jerzy Marek Nowakowski who divided its participants into two groups. The first, more pragmatic, group comprised Świtalski, whom Nowakowski described as the most liberal-minded among the participants, Matuszewski and Bogusław Miedziński. The second group, referred to as dogmatists, included Podoski, Kozłowski and Sławek.[38] It has been correctly observed that the rupture within the *Sanacja* camp after Piłsudski's death ran along this line. However, it is difficult to agree with Nowakowski that the 'dogmatists' aimed to 'infuse social consciousness with the spirit of solidarity' while the 'pragmatists' strove only to remain in power. Both this conference, organized in secret, as well as a long-running dispute between Świtalski and Sławek indicate that this opinion is over-simplified.[39] Almost one year earlier, in conversation with Piłsudski on 31 August 1931, both politicians touched on the subject of the election of the head of state.

[36] Krzysztof Kawalec, *Spadkobiercy niepokornych. Dzieje polskiej myśli politycznej 1918–1939*, Wrocław, 2000, p. 149.

[37] For more on the problem see Paruch, *Myśl polityczna*, pp. 244–63.

[38] Janusz Mierzwa disagrees with this view, saying that it is justified only in relation to Miedziński. Mierzwa argues that 'it would be better to categorize the Piłsudski adherents according to political views. [...] Koc and Matuszewski held the most right-wing views among all the Colonels'. Sławek, Prystor and Jędrzejewicz who in the last years of the Second Republic maintained close contacts with the former comrades from the PPS were placed at the opposite end of the political spectrum. Janusz Mierzwa, *Pułkownik Adam Koc. Biografia polityczna*, Kraków, 2006, p. 157. It seems that the classification offered by Nowakowski is more accurate, for it is difficult to understand on what basis one could consider Sławek as left-wing. His conception of the senate's electoral arrangements was extremely elitist. It needs to be remembered that such generalizations about everyone belonging to the group in question always simplify reality, regardless of the fact that the socialist past of the politicians mentioned by Mierzwa must have influenced their political outlook. Compare: Jerzy Gołębiowski, *Spór o etatyzm wewnątrz obozu sanacyjnego w latach 1926–1939*, Kraków, 1978, p. 82.

[39] Jerzy Marek Nowakowski, 'Konferencja konstytucyjna z czerwca 1932. U źródeł rozbicia grupy pułkowników', *SH*, 25, 1982, 3/4, pp. 446–47.

Świtalski stressed that the problem caused much controversy, for there were fears that the office of president, whose power was to be considerably increased by the new constitution, might, regardless of the method of election, fall into the wrong hands. He also articulated the view that in his opinion 'one had nothing to fear from a plebiscite' and that he was prepared to accede to such a solution. Sławek, 'too scornful of election in general', was obviously dissatisfied with the fact that Piłsudski agreed with Świtalski. The Marshal also criticized the idea of a president whose term was to last longer than ten years, since 'no one is able to exercise public office for so long in good shape'.[40] In reality, the political battle waged within the leadership of the *Sanacja* regime concerned the extent to which the new constitution was supposed to change the existing system. Świtalski, like many other supporters of Józef Piłsudski, advocated strengthening the president's authority. However, convinced that reform had to be based on proven solutions, he was opposed to carrying out the bold experiments favoured by Sławek and his associates. The controversy presented above, while deepening divisions in the circle of Marshal Piłsudski's close associates, forms an important episode in the history of political thought of the group he led.

Drawing on theoretical work carried out by the regime's leading lawyers and politicians, Car and Podoski were able to elaborate the final programme for constitutional reform. In the summer of 1933 they went to Spała at the president's special invitation. There they spent the whole month completing the project.[41] It was then referred to the BBWR's Constitutional Group which held as many as twelve meetings between September and December of the same year, dealing with what was essentially the completed plan for constitutional reform.[42] Podoski later recalled that in the autumn of 1933, the project was also discussed by 'the Assembly of Tenants' (an informal group comprising the incumbent prime minister and his predecessors) which presented their opinions to Car at these informal meetings. They complained that the project 'veered too far away from classical canons in abandoning Montesquieu's principle of separation of powers by concentrating undivided state authority in the person of the President of the Polish Republic'.[43] Podoski counted Świtalski and Prystor among the main critics of the project, which allows us to assume that most

[40] Świtalski, *Diariusz 1919–1935*, pp. 620–21.
[41] Bohdan Podoski, 'Prace nad konstytucją kwietniową', *Niepodległość*, 12, 1979, p. 189.
[42] Chojnowski, *Piłsudczycy u władzy*, pp. 188–90.
[43] Podoski, 'Prace', p. 190.

opinions articulated during these secret meetings must have come from them. This fact is worth noting, since, according to Podoski, Sławek

> called the combined meeting of the BBWR's constitutional groups as well as those of the Sejm and Senate — the latter included all the members of Sejm and Senate Constitution Committees — and presented them with the opinions and suggestions of the 'Tenants' without, however, specifying the authors of these opinions. In the discussion which ensued, the vast majority declared themselves in favour of leaving the existing project unchanged. This decided its fate.[44]

If this information is true, then it is further proof that there were serious divisions within the leadership of the *Sanacja* regime, especially between Świtalski and Sławek. For the time being, however, they posed no threat to the camp's internal unity; for the ideas promoted by the BBWR's head — most conspicuously exemplified in the conception of the so-called Legion of Notables, included in the project and constituting an extremely elitist way of electing members of the upper house of parliament — enjoyed the support of most of its members.[45] The controversy surrounding the constitution came up at the plenary session of the sejm. Parliament discussed the Constitutional Committee's report on the BBWR's motion relating to the change of the constitution. Car proposed to accept the constitutional theses, examined by the afore-mentioned Committee, as the basis for the new constitution. This proposal gained approval from the *Sanacja* leadership who, taking advantage of the absence of the members of the opposition parties, secured the adoption of the new constitution. However, the new constitution was adopted in contravention of the article 125 of the old constitution. According to the article, the constitution could only be changed by a majority of two-thirds, and if at least half the members were in attendance. Moreover, the article required the motion to change the constitution to be signed by at least a quarter of the

[44] A few days after the meeting, Sławek was to request Car to translate the conceptual work into constitutional theses, hoping that at least a part of the opposition would change its attitude towards the plans for the new constitution. See: ibid., pp. 190–91.

[45] For more on the project of the Statute of *Citizen's Cadre* which finally assumed the form of the Legion of Notables see: 'Statut Kadry Obywatelskiej', AAN, BBWR, sign. 89, fols 1–8; 'Statut Legionu Zasłużonych', ibid., fols 23–29; 'Statut Projekt Legionu Zasłużonych', in Kazimierz Władysław Kumaniecki, *Ustrój polityczny Polski. Konstytucja kwietniowa i system wyborczy (sejmowy, senacki, prezydencki). Tekst i studium*, Kraków, 1937, pp. 125–28. See also Komarnicki, *Ustrój państwowy*, pp. 151–54; Kulesza, *Koncepcje ideowo-polityczne*, pp. 138–43; Chojnowski, *Piłsudczycy u władzy*, pp. 214–15; Nowakowski, *Walery Sławek*, pp. 119–23.

members of the house and be announced fifteen days in advance.[46] It is not inconceivable that this was the reason why the speaker of the sejm, Świtalski, protested against the strategy employed by the *Sanacja* leadership. However, he failed to persuade his associates to abandon the new constitution because of a violation of the existing law.[47] A few days later it turned out that the line of action taken by the *Sanacja* leaders did not gain acceptance from Piłsudski himself, as he disapproved of the passing of a crucial legal act by 'wit and trick'. The Marshal, in Świtalski's presence and to his satisfaction, ordered Sławek to refer the constitutional reforms back to parliament. Moreover, Piłsudski also took a negative view of the idea of the so-called Legion of Notables put forward by the BBWR's head.[48] His opposition resulted in the exclusion of this idea from lengthy deliberations concerning the reform programme.[49] The new constitution was finally adopted during the plenary session of parliament on 23 March 1935.[50] Its adoption should be regarded as the culmination of the *Sanacja*'s long efforts, riven by conflicts and controversy, to reform the political system.

The reform of the Polish political system under discussion was to be complemented with Sławek's concept of the so-called General Social Organization. However, it did not obtain the approval of other politicians who counted among the late Marshal's most trusted associates. Sławek's removal from power decided its fate.[51] Conflicts within the circle of the

---

[46] Władysław Rostocki, *Pięćdziesiąt pięć lat mocy obowiązującej Konstytucji Kwietniowej. Ustrój władzy państwowej w ustawie zasadniczej i praktyce*, Lublin, 2002, p. 39.

[47] Podoski, 'Prace', p. 192. For more on the problem see also: Paweł Duber, 'Nieznana relacja na temat ostatniego etapu pracy nad uchwaleniem konstytucji kwietniowej (1934–1935)', *Niepodległość*, 59, 2010, pp. 119–26.

[48] Świtalski, *Diariusz 1919–1935*, pp. 653–55.

[49] On 29 June 1934, with work on the modified constitutional project already under way, Sławek officially backed out of the idea of the Legion of Notables. Consequently, a member of the Senate Constitution Committee, Wojciech Rostworowski, 'removed the respective fragment from the project, leaving the article generally invoking the idea of merit'. See Kulesza, *Koncepcje ideowo-polityczne*, pp. 143, 173. Compare: Andrzej Ajnenkiel, *Konstytucje Polski w rozwoju dziejowym 1791–1997*, Warsaw, 2001, pp. 210–11.

[50] This time, too, the session bent the rules, since the meeting room during this plenary session was filled to the brim and *Sanacja* did not have the necessary two-thirds majority of the votes to pass the amendments to the senate. Ajnenkiel, *Konstytucje Polski*, p. 213.

[51] The proposal for the General Social Organization, along with wide commentaries, was published by Andrzej Chojnowski, see: Andrzej Chojnowski, 'Utopia utracona Walerego Sławka. Projekt Powszechnej Organizacji Społecznej', *PH*, 80, 1989, 2, pp. 353–65. For more on the problem see also: Jan Hoppe, *Wspomnienia, przyczynki, refleksje*, London, 1972, pp. 144–70; Nowakowski, *Walery Sławek*, pp. 144–51.

Piłsudski supporters brought about a reshuffle in the *Sanacja* leadership, resulting in the disintegration of the whole camp, with many leading 'Colonels' pushed to the margins of political life. This of course was not followed by a political void; the BBWR was dissolved and in its place there emerged the two rival political centres, one headed by President Ignacy Mościcki and one led by the General Inspector of the Armed Forces, Edward Rydz-Śmigły.[52] This constellation continued to exist until the outbreak of the Second World War put an end to the thirteen-year rule of the *Sanacja* regime in Poland. In exile, under the new circumstances, the *Sanacja* camp underwent further changes. In 1945, with Poland in the Soviet sphere of influence, the political ideas discussed above, along with the controversy they provoked, entered the history of Polish political thought.

(Translated by Artur Mękarski)

Summary

In seizing almost complete control of Polish political life, Piłsudski did not have a clear-cut programme for rebuilding the foundations of political system. Work on this programme, undertaken long before the May Coup, continued for many years, revealing serious divergences of opinion among the Marshal's close associates. The most significant conflicts involved the attempts to give a new shape to the upper house of parliament, to determine the mutual relations between the executive and legislative branch of the state, and to elaborate the procedure for the election of the president.

It is possible to distinguish two phases in the controversy which divided Piłsudski's adherents. The first, covering the period 1928–30, is connected with the rivalry between Kazimierz Bartel, five-times prime minister during the *Sanacja* era, and a group of Piłsudski's close associates called the 'Colonels'. As it turns out, Bartel went even further in his attempts to impose limitations on parliamentary democracy than the Colonels. However, his proposals failed to receive approval from Piłsudski, and Bartel himself had to retire from public life. The second phase of the aforementioned controversy came in the years 1931–35 and involved deliberations that culminated in the enactment of the April Constitution. Divergences of opinion revealed in the course of these discussions were a factor that accelerated the decomposition of Pisudski's camp after his death.

(Translated by Artur Mękarski)

[52] For more on the issue see: Jerzy Marek Nowakowski, 'Rozpad grupy pułkowników. Pierwsza faza dekompozycji sanacji', *SH*, 31, 1988, 1; Janusz Faryś, 'Dekompozycja ideowa piłsudczyków 1935–1939', *Przegląd Zachodni*, 3, 1988, 3; Paweł Duber, 'Działalność Kazimierza Świtalskiego w pierwszym okresie dekompozycji obozu sanacyjnego (maj 1935–kwiecień 1936)', *Niepodległość*, 57, 2007, pp. 52–94.

Kwartalnik Historyczny
Vol. CXXI, 2014
Special Issue, pp. 143–155
PL ISSN 0023-5903

RAFAŁ STOBIECKI
Institute of History, University of Lodz

KWARTALNIK HISTORYCZNY (THE *HISTORICAL QUARTERLY*). A PORTRAIT SKETCH

I

The essay does not aspire to give a detailed account of the long and complex history of *Kwartalnik Historyczny* (the *Historical Quarterly*). It is an essay which aims to present it against the background of the complex ways Polish historiography has come from the nineteenth century to the present day. The author has never been either a member of the journal's editorial board or a regular contributor. Thus, this contribution offers the perspective of an outsider, which can be as much a strength as it can be a weakness.[1]

[1] Unfortunately, the history of the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* has not so far become the object of a full-length monograph. Among the works concerning the journal one needs to mention in the first place a recently published study by Ukrainian scholar Lidiia M. Lazurko, *Chasopys 'Kwartalnik Historyczny' i rozvytok pol´s´koï istoriografiï ostann´oï chverti XIX — pershoï polovyny XX stolittia*, Drohobych, 2010; Oksana V. Ruda, 'Ukraïns´ka tema na storinkakh l´vivs´koho chasopysu "Kwartalnik Historyczny" ("Istorychnyi kvartal´nyk") v 1887–1914 rr.', *Mizhnarodni zv'iazki Ukraïny: naukovi poshuky i znakhidky*, 2004, 13: *Mizhvidomchyi zbirnyk naukovykh prac´ prysviachenyi pam'iati doktora istorychnykh nauk, profesora I. M. Kulynycha*, pp. 308–21; Vitalii Tel´vak, 'Ukraïns´ka istorychna nauka na storinkakh chasopysu „Kwartalnik Historyczny" (do 1914 r.)', in *Wielokulturowe środowisko historyczne Lwowa w XIX i XX w.*, 5 vols, Rzeszów–L´viv, 2004–07, vol. 3, ed. Jerzy Maternicki, Leonid Zaszkilniak, 2005, pp. 245–56 and the following papers: Krystyna Śreniowska, 'Uwagi o nauce historycznej polskiej w latach 1887–1900 w świetle "Kwartalnika Historycznego"', *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego*, ser. I, 15, Łódź 1960, pp. 153–63; Jerzy Maternicki, 'Miejsce i rola "Kwartalnika Historycznego" w dziejach historiografii polskiej', in idem, *Historia jako dialog. Studia i szkice historiograficzne*, Rzeszów, 1996, pp. 273–90; Wojciech Kriegseisen, '"Kwartalnik Historyczny" — zarys dziejów czasopisma naukowego, *KH*, 102, 2005, 2, pp. 5–27; Zbigniew Pilarczyk, 'Problematyka historyczno-wojskowa na łamach "Kwartalnika Historycznego" w latach 1887–2000', *Studia z Dziejów Polskiej Histo-*

In what follows I shall focus on three main issues. First, I wish to take a closer look at the journal's general conception of itself and the way in which it has evolved during its long existence. Second, I would like to pay closer attention to those moments in the journal's history in which it played an especially important role in stimulating and inspiring the development of Polish historiography. Third, my aim is to consider the journal's role today, as well as the role it is likely to play in the future, especially in the face of deep changes in the meaning that contemporary people are willing to attribute to historical knowledge.

II

The founding of the journal is closely connected with Lwów (now L´viv), the city which, along with Kraków, established itself as a leading centre of Polish historical studies during the period of partitions. On the initiative of Fryderyk Papée, warmly welcomed by Ksawery Liske, the doyen of Lwów's historians, the Historical Association (*Towarzystwo Historyczne*) was established in the city in 1886. It was under the aegis of this newly established organization that the first issue of the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* appeared in the following year. A historian of the modern era, an enthusiastic organizer of scholarly life, and a professor at the Jan Kazimierz University in Lwów, Liske became the journal's first editor-in-chief.

---

riografii Wojskowej, 6, 2002, pp. 9–34; Frank Hadler has offered a juxtaposition of three journals: 'Századok — Kwartalnik Historyczny — Český časopis historický. Drei Konstanten ostmitteleuropäischer Historiographiegeschichte', in *Historische Zeitschriften im internationalen Vergleich*, ed. Mattias Middell, Leipzig, 1999, *Geschichtswissenschaft und Geschichtskultur im 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Gerald Diesener et al., vol. 2, pp. 145–59. Some information concerning the journal can be found in works devoted to the Polish Historical Association: *Polskie Towarzystwo Historyczne 1886–1986. Zbiór studiów i materiałów*, ed. Stefan Kuczyński, Wrocław, Warsaw and Kraków, 1990; Tadeusz Kondracki, *Polskie Towarzystwo Historyczne w latach 1918–1939*, Toruń, 2006; Tadeusz Paweł Rutkowski, *Polskie Towarzystwo Historyczne w latach 1945–1958. Zarys dziejów*, Toruń, 2009; Fryderyk Papée, 'Towarzystwo Historyczne 1886–1900', *KH*, 51, 1937, pp. 1–18; Eugeniusz Barwiński, 'Towarzystwo Historyczne 1901–1914', *KH*, 51, 1937, pp. 19–40; Teofil Emil Modelski, 'Towarzystwo Historyczne 1914–1924', *KH*, 51, 1937, pp. 41–88; Kazimierz Tyszkowski, 'Polskie Towarzystwo Historyczne 1925–1936', *KH*, 51, 1937, pp. 89–137. Worthy of mention are also some accounts of the periodical's accomplishments. See, for example, Teofil Emil Modelski, 'Ze wspomnień i zapisek Redaktora', *KH*, 60, 1963, 3, pp. 599–606; Stanisław Kętrzyński, 'Memoriał w sprawie "Kwartalnika Historycznego"', *KH*, 60, 1963, 3, pp. 607–21; Bogusław Leśnodorski, 'Nasze pragnienia — nasze troski', *KH*, 60, 1963, 3, pp. 637–43; Tadeusz Łepkowski, 'Nowa seria "Kwartalnika Historycznego" (1953–62) w świetle liczb', *KH*, 60, 1963, 3, pp. 623–36; Tadeusz Jędruszczak, '"Kwartalnik Historyczny" — problemy aktualne i zamierzenia', *KH*, 74, 1977, 3, pp. 391–96.

One may suggest that the journal was founded as a response to the growing professionalization of historical studies. In 1864, August Bielowski published the first volume of *Acta Poloniae Historica*, a series based on the renowned *Acta Germaniae Historica*. In 1869, Józef Szujski was appointed to the first chair of Polish History established at the Jagiellonian University, while, in 1872, the Historical Commission that grouped Polish scholars from the whole of partitioned Poland was formed within the Polish Academy of Learning (Polska Akademia Umiejętności) in Kraków. There was also an expansion of what is usually referred to as a critical method of studying history which came to Poland from Germany, and the increase in the number of historians who were beginning to form something of a professional guild came to be accompanied by the establishment of the first historical seminars.

This process was seen right across Europe. *Historische Zeitschrift*, which is universally acknowledged to have been the first scholarly journal in the field of history, became the model for that published in Lwów.[2] It is no accident that the founding of the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* roughly coincided in time with the appearance of historical journals in other European countries. The Hungarian *Századok* first appeared in 1867, the French *Revue historique* began to be published in 1876, and 1886 saw the publication of the first issue of the *English Historical Review*. Others were not long in coming — *Istoricheskoe obozrenie* came into being in 1891 and *Český časopis historický* was established in 1895.

III

In a timespan of more than 120 years, the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* has evolved, moved its headquarters, and been headed by different editors whose personalities, scholarly interests, and positions occupied in the academic world left a profound mark upon the journal's shape.[3] Until 1939 the journal's office was in Lwów. After the Second World War it was for a short time published in Kraków, before the operation was moved to Warsaw in 1950. Until 1952, it appeared under the aegis of the Polish Historical Association (earlier the Historical Association).

[2] It is worth remembering that K. Liske for many years served as a regular contributor to the *Historische Zeitschrift* where he reviewed historical studies published by Polish scholars.

[3] I set aside here the problem of how the individuality of subsequent editors-in-chief affected the shape of particular issues of the journal. Aleksander Semkowicz, a superb editor, can serve here as an example. He ran the journal alone in 1895–97, 1899–1904, 1906–14, 1920–22 — that is, for twenty years.

However, in 1953, following the Stalinization of Polish historiography, the editorship of the journal was taken over by the Institute of History of the Polish Academy of Sciences (Instytut Historii Polskiej Akademii Nauk — IH PAN), which was formed in January 1953. In the same year, there appeared the first issue of the *Kwartalnik* in its new form.[4] That the journal deviated then from its tradition was symbolized by the removal of the name of its founding-father, Liske, from its title page. Today, with Liske's name restored, the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* is published under the joint aegis of the Institute of History of the Polish Academy of Sciences and the Polish Historical Association.

The first issue of the journal from 1887 was printed by the Władysław Łoziński Printing House in Lwów. Its pages, more than 700 in number, are now yellowed with age. The first section contains papers written by the leading figures in Polish historiography of the era when Poland was still partitioned between Russia, Austria and Germany: Ferdynand Bostel, Tadeusz Korzon, Władysław Łoziński, Antoni Małecki, Władysław Smoleński. Appended to the first issue is *Sprawozdanie z Czynności Wydziału Towarzystwa Historycznego we Lwowie* [...] *za rok 1886/87* (A Report of the Proceedings of the Historical Association in Lwów in [...] 1886/87). The report offers the following explanation of the journal's purposes: 'It aims to become an organ uniting all forces involved in the study of the past and to present a clear-cut picture of Polish historiography by providing information about all publications devoted to Polish history, by presenting their most important findings, and by discussing their strengths and weaknesses'.[5]

At first, it was agreed that the journal should above all serve as a forum for exchanging scholarly information and for reviewing historical works. Undoubtedly, it was the journal's first editor — Liske — who played a crucial role in making it assume such a form. The *Kwartalnik Historyczny* was then supposed to register and discuss the whole of 'historical production' — or at least that part which deserved to be assembled under the rubric of academic historiography. The editorial staff's focus was on monographs, collections of articles, editions of pri-

[4] For more on the problem see Rafał Stobiecki, *Historia pod nadzorem. Spory o nowy model historii w Polsce druga połowa lat czterdziestych — początek lat pięćdziesiątych*, Łódź, 1993, pp. 101–10; Tadeusz Paweł Rutkowski, *Nauki historyczne w Polsce 1944–1970. Zagadnienia polityczne i organizacyjne*, Warsaw, 2007, pp. 161–62; idem, *Polskie Towarzystwo Historyczne*, pp. 73–76.

[5] *Sprawozdanie z Czynności Wydziału Towarzystwa Historycznego we Lwowie tudzież Komitetu Redakcyjnego Kwartalnika Historycznego za rok 1886/87 od 14 października 1886 do 1 października 1887*, 1, 1887, p. 5.

mary sources, and, to a lesser degree, historical syntheses. The journal was divided into the following sections: 'Historical Studies', 'Materials on the History of Poland and Russia', 'List of More Important Reviews Published in Other Periodicals', 'Bibliography of the Most Important Works by Foreign Historians', 'Reports of the Proceedings of the Historical Association'. In the first year's issue, it was the review section that was most extensive, with a total of 264 reviews. The subsequent years did not differ in this regard. The second issue included as many as 203 reviews. 154 reviews appeared in the journal's third issue. In the mid-1890s the number of reviews remained at the level of 200 per year, but fell to about 100 at the end of the century.[6] The vast majority of the reviews dealt with works on Polish history written by both Polish and foreign authors, mainly Germans and Russians.

From the very outset, the editorial board, committed to positivist ideals, attempted to publish papers that discussed problems beyond the realm of political history. The appreciation of the importance of 'domestic history' resulted in the appearance of reviews concerning the history of education, art, economy, law and mores. Texts addressing geography, ethnography or archeology were also published. The journal also devoted some space to reviews of works important in terms of the historian's craft, those lying in the field of the so-called auxiliary sciences of history, such as numismatics, diplomacy, or sphragistics.

It was in stages, and rather inconsistently, that the editors tried to change the journal's traditional emphasis, and it is justifiable to say that their efforts did not result in a new and clear-cut conception of the journal. However, as early as the inter-war period, the journal's centre of gravity of the had begun to shift in favour of papers and articles. This tendency found its specific continuation during the period of the Polish People's Republic. In compliance with the principles imposed by the Communist authorities, the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* was supposed to play a leading role in effecting a methodological — in fact, an ideological — transformation of Polish historiography inspired by the Stalinist form of Marxism. From the turn of 1940s and 1950s, there began to appear propagandistic texts proclaiming the embrace of the new methodology. A paper by Kazimierz Piwarski, who then served as editor-in-chief of the journal, was one of the first of this kind. Published in the 1949 issue, it bore the title 'The Crisis of Bourgeois Historiography and Historical Materialism'.[7] The first half of the 1950s also saw the brief appearance of a new section entitled 'In the

[6] I quote from Papée, 'Towarzystwo Historyczne', p. 11.
[7] *KH*, 46, 1949, 1, pp. 3–42.

Struggle Against Hostile Ideology' which served to 'condemn pseudoscientific works of bourgeois historians'. Most of the essays that were then printed in the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* clearly did not meet most historians' ideas of scholarly standards. The most telling example in this context is the paper written by several authors published in 1953 and entitled 'The Significance of Josef Stalin's Works for the Development of Polish Historiography'.[8]

After the 'October Thaw' of 1956 the journal regained its scholarly character. As Wojciech Kriegseisen has rightly remarked: 'it soon turned out that the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* simply was not able to inform [its readers] about all scholarly initiatives undertaken in Poland'.[9] In these circumstances, it was found that the most important task with which the journal ought to be entrusted was to publish original papers based on neglected primary sources. The editorial board attempted to organize scholarly debates and also to invite contributions from other scholars, such as economists, sociologists and literary critics.

However, looking at the journal's history, it is difficult to ignore the fact that the controversies that surrounded its publication usually had as their leitmotif complaints concerning shortcomings found in the review section, and its failure to provide thorough scholarly information. As early as the 1920s, points were often raised about the diminishing number of reviews which themselves were regarded as addressing too narrow a spectrum of topics.[10] Successive editorial boards attempted to respond to this criticism. However, one needs to say that this response was not always satisfactory.[11]

The question of whether the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* should serve in the first place as a vehicle for providing scholarly information was also debated after 1945. However, given the changes historiography was undergoing at that time, it was becoming increasingly difficult for the journal to remain concerned mainly with the dissemination of scholarly information. Suffice it to say that the 1986 issue contained about 100 reviews and review arti-

[8] The authors of the paper were a team from Instytut Kształcenia Kadr Naukowych przy KC PZPR (The Training Institute for Scientific Cadres affiliated with the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party). The group included the following persons: Stanisław Arnold, Tadeusz Daniszewski, Leon Grosfeld, Józef Kowalski, Żanna Kormanowa, Witold Kula and Bogusław Leśnodorski (the latter then served as the journal's editor-in-chief).

[9] Kriegseisen, '"Kwartalnik Historyczny"', p. 24.

[10] For example, issues published in the years 1923–24 included about 50 reviews. Kondracki, *Polskie Towarzystwo Historyczne*, p. 152.

[11] From the 1920s the number of reviews steadily grew. In the 1930s the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* published about 100 reviews annually.

cles. Considering the fact that by this time the volume of the journal had grown twice as large as that issued in the inter-war period, and that there was a considerable increase in the number of books published, a total of 100 reviews is hardly an impressive or significant figure.[12] Much space within the *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, especially in the issues published after 1945, was taken up by information included in the section called 'Chronicle'. This section was added in 1898, and after the Second World War it was filled mainly with accounts of various scholarly conferences, or reports of the proceedings of a variety of committees and research teams. Given frequent delays in printing the journal, this information was usually out of date at the moment of its publication. However, it was not until towards the end of the twentieth century that the decision was made to remove this section from the journal.

To conclude this section, it is worth taking a look at volume 118, published in 2011, which contains the usual four issues. Today's *Kwartalnik Historyczny* has a similar number of sections as its very first nineteenth century issue. These are: 'Articles', 'Reviews — Polemics — Propositions', 'Review Articles and Reviews', 'In Memoriam', 'Communications', 'Letters to the Editors'. However, not all of the sections are found in every issue. It is the first and third sections that are of key importance. Out of a total of 75 texts published in 2011, including obituaries, communications, and letters to the editors, there are 53 review articles, reviews, and polemics. It is easy to see then, that apart from some modifications, the editorial board decided to give the journal the form which characterized it in the nineteenth century. Was this a good choice? I shall return to the question later.

IV

For all the commitment to the idea of a journal primarily concerned with illustrating changes in Polish historiography, the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* has rarely initiated important discussions that could be given credit for articulating the state of the profession and determining its future course. Looking from a long perspective, one is able to indicate only a few moments when articles that appeared in the pages of the journal played an essential role in stimulating the development of Polish historiography.

The 1870s, 1880s and 1890s bore witness to a very heated debate that swept over Polish historiography. It concerned the interpretation of the

[12] Maternicki, 'Miejsce i rola', p. 278.

causes of the fall of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the eighteenth century. During the debate the so-called Kraków school of history clashed with its Warsaw opponent. The first gave rise to a vision of Polish history which has ever since been referred to as 'pessimistic'. Focusing on the internal problems of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, it held the Poles themselves responsible for the collapse of their state, putting forward the so-called theory of the self-inflicted downfall. The Warsaw school, for its part, paying special attention to the reformist movement that engulfed the Polish-Lithuanian state in the second half of the eighteenth century, laid the emphasis on external factors (the aggressive tendencies of the neighbouring powers) and their role in bringing about the partitions. The Warsaw school has ever since been referred to as 'optimistic'. Papers that appeared in the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* at the turn of the 1880s and 1890s constituted part of this historiographical contest. Among the historians who took part in the discussion were Kazimierz Waliszewski and Oswald Balzer. Waliszewski was the first to criticize the theory of the self-inflicted fall.[13] In a paper written in reaction to the opinions articulated by the Russian historian, Nikolai Kareev, who fully supported the interpretation advanced by Michał Bobrzyński in *An Outline of the History of Poland* (Bobrzyński was one of the leading representatives of the Kraków school), Waliszewski attacked both the political and historical presuppositions that underlay the Kraków school's vision of Polish history. According to Waliszewski, this vision was deeply pessimistic, depriving the Poles of any hope they may have (had) left. Moreover, its proponents tried to copy the German model of practising history, placing the state at the centre of their interests. Starting from such premises, they bolstered the case made by both Russian and German historians who portrayed the Poles as prone to anarchy and inherently incapable of building their own state.

Waliszewski's views elicited a critical response from Balzer which was published in the same issue.[14] Balzer argued that there was no rea-

[13] Kazimierz Waliszewski, 'Historiografia polska przed krytyką rosyjską', *KH*, 2, 1888, pp. 555–70. The work was written in connection with a small monograph by N. Kareev, *Najnowszy zwrot w historiografii polskiej, 1861–1886*, Warsaw and St Petersburg, 1888. See also other texts by Waliszewski, *Potoccy i Czartoryscy. Walka stronnictw politycznych przed upadkiem Rzeczypospolitej*, Kraków, 1887; idem, *Polska i Europa w drugiej połowie XVIII wieku. Wstęp do historii ruchu politycznego w tej epoce*, Kraków, 1890. For more on the debate between Waliszewski and the Kraków school see: Andrzej F. Grabski, '"Podpalacze" przeciw "lidze brandmajstrów". Z dziejów walki z krakowską szkołą historyczną', in idem, *Perspektywy przeszłości. Studia i szkice historiograficzne*, Lublin, 1983, pp. 341–412.

[14] Oswald Balzer rev. Kazimierz Waliszewski, 'Polityczne i społeczne obyczaje XVIII wieku', *KH*, 2, 1888, pp. 677–79.

son to assume that this 'pessimistic historiosophy' was likely to have a harmful and demoralizing effect upon Polish society. On the contrary, the admission of one's own guilt was an expression of 'optimism' as it gave one a chance to rectify one's errors and 'build a better future'.[15] This debate saw its continuation in a famous paper by one of the leaders of the Warsaw school, Tadeusz Korzon, delivered two years later to the Second Congress of Polish Historians held in Lwów.[16]

Controversies over Polish history were again reflected in the pages of the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* at the end of the First World War. Following its outbreak, Polish historiography grew increasingly 'optimistic' about the national past. This optimism arose over the need to justify Polish rights to independence, with historical arguments being turned into a weapon used in this struggle. This optimistic tendency was carried to extremes in a pamphlet by Antoni Chołoniewski published in 1917 and titled *The Spirit of Polish History*. It contained an apologetic exposition of Polish history, bordering on national megalomania and stating that throughout their history the Poles far outstripped all other nations (religious toleration, nobiliary democracy), and that the fall of their state was the result of collusion by predatory neighbours. One of the texts that emerged as a response to Chołoniewski's pamphlet was published in the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* in 1918. It bore the title 'Ideologia ustrojowa' (Constitutional Ideology).[17] Its author, Stanisław Zakrzewski, positioned himself as a defender of positivist historiography that 'places the head before the heart' and tends to draw a clear demarcation line between scholarly thinking and 'cheap journalism'. He chastised the apologists of the national past for allowing themselves to be swayed by present-day interests and for looking at the history of their own country through the prism of the development of systems of government. Calling for a critical approach to the national past, he displayed a commitment to the idea

[15] Ibid., p. 679.

[16] Reprinted in *Historycy o historii*, ed. Marian Henryk Serejski, 2 vols, Warsaw, 1963–66, vol. 1.

[17] *KH*, 32, 1918, pp. 1–41. In fact, S. Zakrzewski also criticized the works by Oswald Balzer, Stanisław Kutrzeba and Wacław Tokarz. For more on the problem see Andrzej Wierzbicki, 'Wokół Ducha dziejów Polski. Spory o ocenę dziejów narodowych w historiografii polskiej 1917–1919', *KH*, 68, 1971, 4, pp. 840–56. About changes in polish historiography and *Kwartalnik Historyczny* see Lidiia Lazurko, 'Problemy stanovlennia pol´s´koï istorychnoï nauky mizhvoiennoho periodu na storinkakh "Istorychnoho kvartal´nyka"', in *Wielokulturowe środowisko historyczne Lwowa w XIX i XX w.*, vol. 4, ed. Leonid Zaszkilniak and Jerzy Maternicki, 2006, pp. 396–409.

of independent scholarship, convinced that historical studies should not become embroiled in ideological squabbles.[18]

Finally, worthy of mention is also the role of the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* in the de-Stalinization of Polish historiography in the years 1956–58. All the key elements of the Stalinist model of history and historiography were criticized strongly in the pages of the journal, including organizational structures of 'Polish *Clio*', its theoretico-methodological foundations, and the vision of Polish history promoted in the first half of the 1950s.[19] It should be remembered that this criticism was still constrained by the censorship that had not ended with the Stalinist era. Two powerful texts with a significant symbolic meaning were then published in the *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. Characteristically, they were written by historians representing opposing worldviews.

Witold Kula was the author of the first of these papers.[20] It was entitled 'On Our Scientific Policy'. His criticism of Stalinism derived from the experience of a disappointed Marxist, in whose opinion the rebuilding of Polish historiography inspired by the Communist authorities had ended in failure, or, at best, in only qualified success. Adopting the perspective of a Marxist historian, Kula declared himself in favour of continuing the work of rebuilding the methodological foundations of Polish historiography. He stressed, however, that this process should no longer be subjected to interference by the state.[21]

The second of the papers to appear in the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* regarding the de-Stalinization of Polish historiography was written by Henryk Wereszycki. Persecuted by the Communist authorities, Wereszycki held views which had little to do with official Marxism. In his article 'Pesymizm błędnych tez'[22] (The Pessimism of Erroneous Theses),

[18] The publication of the paper exacerbated the already tense relations between historians from Lwów and Kraków. It was not until the 1920s that this animosity began to subside. Earlier, in January 1918, Zakrzewski was forced by historians from Kraków to resign as the journal's editor-in-chief. See: Kriegseisen, '"Kwartalnik Historyczny"', pp. 13–14.

[19] For more on the problem see Andrzej Czyżewski, 'Historycy polscy wobec destalinizacji — próba analizy postaw', in *Klio polska. Studia i materiały z dziejów historiografii polskiej po II wojnie światowej*, ed. Andrzej Wierzbicki, Warsaw, 2004–, vol. 3, 2008, pp. 192–210; Rafał Stobiecki, *Historiografia PRL. Ani dobra, ani mądra ani piękna... ale skomplikowana. Studia i szkice*, Warsaw, 2007.

[20] *KH*, 53, 1956, 3, pp. 151–66.

[21] Ibid., p. 166. Kula's paper was brought up for discussion during a special meeting held in the Institute of History of Polish Academy of Sciences on 26 June 1956. See: 'Dyskusja nad obecnym stanem i możliwościami rozwojowymi naszej nauki historycznej', *KH*, 53, 1956, pp. 72–87.

[22] *KH*, 54, 1957, 3–4, pp. 13–30. The text was initially presented in the spring of

Wereszycki referred mainly to the Stalinist vision of Polish history. In his opinion, Stalinist historiography was to blame for projecting ideological argumentation into the past in such a way as to justify the political, social, and territorial shape of the Polish People's Republic, which not only violated the fundamental principles every historian was called upon to respect and follow, but also made it impossible for historiography to serve the purpose of cultivating national culture.[23] Wereszycki's paper sparked off a heated debate which was also published in the *Kwartalnik Historyczny*.[24]

The examples given above show that throughout its long history the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* served as a mirror reflecting, often with some delay, phenomena occurring within Polish historiography, rather than as a leading protagonist advocating a ground-breaking approach to the study of the past. With the exception of the Stalinist period, successive editorial boards tried to dissociate themselves from the political circumstances in which they operated, always following scholarly criteria in the choice of the papers published in the journal. Even under the Communist dictatorship, they tried to remain faithful to the formula the publication assumed in the nineteenth century. Characteristically enough, the journal's editors also did not decide to prepare a special issue that could in some way encapsulate the experience of the post-war period. The 1987 anniversary issue was very different from the one published in 1937. The latter attempted to offer an assessment of the accomplishments of Polish historiography as seen through the prism of the fifty years of publishing the leading Polish historical periodical.

V

What future lies ahead of this noble journal at the beginning of the twenty--first century? What role, according to the present editorial board, should it play in Polish historiography? Or, to put it another way, what kind of *Kwartalnik Historyczny* does Polish historiography need? It seems that for many reasons there can be no return to the shape in which it was founded

1957 during the meeting of the Kraków Branch of the Polish Historical Association. The text was Wereszycki's polemic against the second volume of the so-called mock--up edition of 'A History of Poland' prepared by IH PAN. The discussion devoted to the volume was also held during the conference organized by IH PAN in Sulejówek near Warsaw (14–17 April 1957). Materials from the conference were later published in the pages of the *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, 54, 1957.

[23] Ibid., pp. 13–14.

[24] Ibid.

by Liske and his associates. What then appears to be the best line for the editorial board to take?

First, in the face of a strong competition among historical journals (there are more 100 historical journals published in Poland), of an increasing specialization of historical studies and the resulting pluralization of methods, and of a great increase in 'historical production' generally, the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* should distinguish itself from other journals through a coherent programme, the high academic standard of the papers published in it, and by having the courage to include new areas of research. When judged from that angle, recent issues of the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* seem to be lacking in interviews with historians, in papers presenting new trends in historical studies, or in manifesto-like texts promoting the exploration of subjects that lie at the intersection of different humanistic disciplines.[25] Such texts mirror an interdisciplinary character of historical studies in the world of today.

Second, in the era of the internet, it seems urgent to bring the process of digitalizing the back issues to a successful completion.[26] A historical journal must also be equipped with an attractive web page to draw young people. In my opinion, this condition is only partly met by the *Kwartalnik Historyczny*'s present web page, part of the website of the Institute of History of the Polish Academy of Sciences. A history of the journal, the portraits of its editors and links referring to other information about Polish historiography are all absent from the web page in question.

Third, the present *Kwartalnik Historyczny* also only in part exercises the function of a nationwide journal. Despite changes in the editorial board and the efforts undertaken to draw scholars from other centres of historical studies in Poland, the journal is generally associated with Warsaw and considered to be dominated by Warsaw historians. To become a periodical of nationwide representation, the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* needs to register the most interesting phenomena occurring in Polish historiography and to promote books and editions of primary sources published outside of Warsaw.

---

[25] In the present version of the journal, the section *Reviews — Polemics — Propositions* includes nothing but idiographic contributions that usually amount to a polemical exchange between authors.

[26] The issues from the years 1887–1939 are presently available on the webpage of Śląska Biblioteka Cyfrowa (Silesian Digital Library): 〈http://www.sbc.org.pl/publication/8429〉; issues from the years 1939–52 — Kujawsko-Pomorska Biblioteka Cyfrowa (Kujawsko-Pomorska Digital Library): 〈http://kpbc.umk.pl/publication/46203〉; issues from the years 1953–2013 — Repozytorium Cyfrowe Instytutów Naukowych (RCIN) (Digital Repository of Scientific Institutes): 〈http://rcin.org.pl/publication/35143〉.

The editorial board appears to be aware of the challenges that are facing it. One may note with some satisfaction that the editors decided to open the journal to contemporary history that had usually been seen as less important than that of other periods. This new approach can be seen in every section of the journal. Thus, those who are now in charge of *Kwartalnik Historyczny* managed to avoid the mistake committed by the editors of *Teki Historyczne* (Historical Papers — the journal published in London by Polish scholars who after the Second World War decided to stay in exile. Its first issue appeared in 1947) who clung to the view that historical evidence had or has to be aged for at least fifty magical years before it could be dealt with. The attempt to publish discussions on some historical books also needs to be regarded as an interesting initiative. The review section presents itself quite well. The editors try to single out important publications, representing different historical disciplines and periods.

Of course, it is easier to advise than to act. However, one should wish that the editors succeed in turning this noble journal's long tradition into an important argument in a discussion on both the role of the journal itself, and the development of Polish historiography in years to come.

(Translated by Artur Mękarski)

Kwartalnik Historyczny
Vol. CXXI, 2014
Special Issue, pp. 157–168
PL ISSN 0023-5903

HALINA MANIKOWSKA
The Tadeusz Manteuffel Institute of History
Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw

DOES THE CONCEPT OF 'POPULAR RELIGION' IN THE MIDDLE AGES STILL MAKE SENSE? REGARDING ALICJA SZULC'S *HOMO RELIGIOSUS*

Published six years after Małgorzata Maciszewska's study *Klasztor bernardyński w społeczeństwie polskim 1453–1530* (Warsaw 2001), this book by Alicja Szulc[1] might be taken as its necessary complement.[2] Maciszewska's study mainly concerns the expansion of the monastic network of the Observant Franciscans (called Bernardines, after St Bernardino of Siena, in Poland), with the friars' settlement in cities and medieval society, and with a picture of their recruitment based on social status. Introducing some minor corrections to the picture presented by Maciszewska (Part I: Observant Franciscans of the Polish province in the Middle Ages — chapters 1–2), Szulc concentrates mainly on examining the pastoral work of the first three generations of Observant Franciscans. Her focus is on the way in which a specific type of religiosity characterizing the order was disseminated among the faithful. She starts with a discussion of the friars' education and intellectual outlook (chapter 3). In analysing the spread of the religiosity they promoted, she deals in the first place with its technical aspects and its main tools (Part II: Word--picture-sound. Observants' techniques of shaping mass religiosity, chapters 1–5): preaching, confession, stage performances, images, 'paraliturgical' services, tertiary communities and confraternities. It is worth noting here that Szulc is unfortunately much less interested in the content of this religiosity.

---

[1] Alicja Szulc, *Homo religiosus późnego średniowiecza. Bernardyński model religijności masowej / Homo religiosus of the late middle ages. The Bernardine's model of popular religion*, Poznań 2007, *Studia i Materiały*, Uniwersytet im.Adama Mickiewicza. Wydział Teologiczny, 100, pp. 256.

[2] In this review article I take into consideration Polish studies of the Middle Ages, leaving out those that deal with later periods as well as those of long vintage devoted to Polish popular Catholicism of the modern era. Compare: Stefan Czarnowski, 'Kultura religijna wiejskiego ludu polskiego', in idem, *Dzieła*, 5 vols, ed. Nina Assorodobraj and Stanisław Ossowski, Warsaw, 1956, vol. 1, pp. 88–107.

Szulc's study is based as much upon primary sources — ranging from chronicles and sermons to poetry, liturgical dramas and paintings — as it is on secondary literature. The most significant part of the latter is represented mainly by Polish historiography, including the history of literature and art history as well as history in the stricter sense. Although critically used and corrected when necessary, this historiography remains the author's main guide in producing a list of research questions and in choosing the method for analysing the primary sources. While many works of western historiography are referenced in the footnotes, a significant proportion of these are absent from the bibliography and, one assumes, they have been omitted deliberately. However, in failing to rebel against methods and questions underpinning Polish works devoted to the subject, or against their parochialism, evident in the dismissal of comparative approaches, Szulc deprives herself of the chance to present a new and original picture of the problem. This is all the more regrettable given that Szulc proves herself capable of scholarly independence when stating in the preface that the term 'popular religion/piety' is no longer useful. However, she fails to go a step further, as she has not drawn conclusions either from important works that have appeared over the past four decades, such as those by Raul Manselli, and Étienne Delaruelle,[3] or from the vivid discussion that took place in the 1970s and 1980s concerning the concept of popular religion.[4] Such a step would have led her to reject the concepts on which she decided to base her analysis, such as mass piety, the piety of *illitterati*. But this charge can hardly be laid against a young scholar and a doctoral dissertation.

The topic which she has chosen to analyse, Observants' religiosity, if it is to be dealt with in a way that is both insightful and bold, and that allows one to feel confident about one's conclusions, requires testing different methods and studying a variety of issues, thus gradually increasing our knowledge of the main points of interest. It also calls for much erudition, passion and, of course, a refusal to be satisfied with the models hitherto used to study the topic at hand. Very few works of this kind, devoted to religious culture of the Middle

[3] Raul Manselli, *La religiosità popolare nel Medio Evo*, Turin, 1974; Étienne Delaruelle, *La piété populaire au Moyen Âge*, Turin, 1975.

[4] I wish to refer here only to publications that appeared after important international conferences, the two of which were organized by the Canadian Centre d'études des religions populaires established in 1968, *Les religions populaires: Colloque international 1970*, ed. Benoît Lacroix and Pietro Boglioni, Québec, 1972; *Foi populaire, foi savante. Actes du V^e Colloque du Centre d'études d'histoire des religions populaires tenu au Collège dominicain de théologie (Ottawa)*, Paris, 1977; *Le christianisme populaire. Les dossiers de l'histoire*, ed. Bernard Plongeron and Robert Pannet, Paris, 1976; and *La piété populaire au moyen âge. Actes du 99^e congrès national des sociétés savantes. Besançon, 1974, Section de philologie et d'histoire jusqu'à 1610*, 2 vols, Paris, 1977, vol. 1; *La religion populaire: Colloque international du CNRS en 1977*, ed. Guy Duboscq et al., Paris, 1979. Compare also the discussion of different models of 'popular religion' in Micheline Laliberté: 'Définitions et approches divers de la religion populaire', *Rabaska: Revue d'ethnologie de l'Amérique française*, 8, 2010, pp. 7–18, which appeared after the publication of Szulc's book.

Ages, have appeared in Polish historiography and Szulc appears not to be prepared to use analytical models to their fullest potential.[5] Instead, she has opted for a model whose applicability has been questioned for at least ten years, and has decided to draw on research methods that make the most complex historical discipline, the history of culture, reduced to a simple enumeration — too often accompanied by trivial comments and empty conclusions — of authors, texts and topics.

One needs to start with the model on which Szulc relies — that of mass religiosity, *illitteratorum*. She is right to distance herself from the term popular religion, the meaning of which in Polish is even more restricted than in other languages that adopted the Latin word *populus*, for the noun *lud* (*populus*) and adjective *ludowy* denote mainly the peasant population. It is because of this linguistic ambivalence that Polish medievalists who, inspired mainly by the *Annales* school, introduced into Polish historiography *l'histoire de mentalité* or *l'imaginaire* have also tended to avoid this term. In an effort to breathe new life into studies of medieval culture, of which the evidence is so scarce for Poland, they proceeded to explore new topics such as collective behaviour, different worldviews and feelings.[6] In so doing, they have tried to replace the term popular religion with other concepts that were better suited to their historical subjects. Aleksandra Witkowska has explained in great detail the use of the term, pointing out that popular religion does not refer only 'to one social group to be regarded as corresponding to the rural or plebeian population'.[7] However, relying on another category — religiosity of *illitterati* — Szulc remains within the framework of the same dichotomical model of late medieval religion, and makes no attempt to discuss the extent of its applicability. Such a discussion, one regrets to say, has never been attempted in Polish historiography.

In 2000 there appeared the proceedings of a conference held two years earlier by the Associazione Italiana per lo Studio della Santità, dei Culti e dell'Agiografia and entitled *Il pubblico dei santi. Forme e livelli di ricezione dei messaggi agiografici*. No contributor to the volume used the term popular religion in the title of their paper, although fifteen years ago it would have been indispensable. For an even longer period it appeared on the covers of scholarly books and in tables of contents. In the work mentioned above the second word in the phrase 'popular religion' was replaced by *il sentire religioso*, to be studied from the perspective of the nave, while the word 'popular', *popolo*, transformed itself into

[5] Especially Wojciech Brojer's work based on *exempla* that are also used by Szulc: Wojciech Brojer, *Diabeł w wyobraźni średniowiecznej*, Wrocław, 2003; see also Stanisław Bylina on collective piety: 'Wiara i pobożność zbiorowa', published in *Kultura Polski średniowiecznej. XIV–XV w.*, ed. Bronisław Geremek, Warsaw, 1997, pp. 403–50; and of a study by Aleksandra Witkowska: *Kulty pątnicze piętnastowiecznego Krakowa. Z badań nad miejską kulturą religijną*, Lublin, 1984.

[6] Bronisław Geremek, 'Przedmowa', in *Kultura elitarna a kultura masowa w Polsce późnego średniowiecza*, ed. idem, Wrocław, 1978, p. 7.

[7] Witkowska, *Kulty pątnicze*, p. 30.

pubblico. However, to abandon inconvenient terminology is not automatically to part with old conceptualizations or indeed with the prime purpose of the research on popular religion, namely to penetrate the religiosity of ordinary people, of this silent majority.

This is no place to discuss the birth and development of studies in popular (religiosity or) religion. Nor is it one to talk about all the disappointments which, after years of triumphs (in the 1970s and 1980s), led to the rejection of a once fashionable approach. However, one needs to highlight the initial standpoints underlying its adoption, since they have affected, and in Polish historiography still affect — which is clearly seen in the work under review — the way in which medieval and early modern culture, and religion in particular, is understood.

The most important among these standpoints is one which presupposes a sharp division between the elite and the ordinary people. It relies upon the belief in the existence of two distinct, alternative cultures — one represented by the learned (clergy and elites) and another represented by those of lower social status (laymen). The first, regarded as dominant, is connected with the activity of the 'Church which, through parish and monastic clergy, disseminates patterns of piety'.[8] This standpoint rose to the position of a paradigm whose applicability was assumed to go beyond the times of Christianization and the early Middle Ages.[9]

However, this dichotomy is burdened with some serious problems, some of which are inherent while others developed in the course of research, polemics, and attempts to disprove the belief in the Christian Middle Ages as adhered to by past generations of historians. The first problem involves a deeply-rooted fondness for the people thought of as representing primeval and uncorrupt values. It is connected with an anti-elitist psychological complex relating to the domination of the elite and the exploitation of those below. It is also rooted in the assumption that popular culture should be perceived as a reservoir of archetypes, myths and long-established (the lack of precision is here deliberate) mental schemes fostering specific behaviour. The second problem involves attempts to fit, under the influence of cultural anthropology and religious studies, Western medieval folklore into the model developed by scholars studying primitive societies. Within this model, the folklore in question is to be seen as resistant to change. Even if it does lend itself to change, this transformation

[8] Quotation from Bylina, 'Wiara', p. 418. However, in placing a greater emphasis on the deepening of the religiosity of all medieval social groups, he takes a more nuanced position ('a Christian gesture of prayer was common to all', ibid., p. 418), than Bronisław Geremek who wrote about a domination of religion by the culture of the 'elites'.

[9] Compare especially: Jacques Le Goff, 'Culture cléricale et traditions folkloriques dans la civilisation mérovingienne', *Annales. ESC*, 22, 1967, 4, pp. 780–91; idem, 'Culture ecclésiastique et culture folklorique au Moyen Âge: Saint Marcel de Paris et le dragon', in *Ricerche storiche ed economiche in memoria di Corrado Barbagallo*, 3 vols, ed. Luigi de Rosa, Naples, 1970, vol. 2, pp. 53–90; and also Jean-Claude Schmitt, '"Religion populaire" et culture folklorique (note critique)', *Annales. ESC*, 31, 1976, 5, pp. 941–53.

is always very slow, and thus clearly falling under the category of the *longue durée*. With regard to the early Middle Ages, such an approach means treating Europe as part of Indo-European folklore marked by a great dissemination of magical thinking that is believed to have permeated religious life. A multitude of historians, such as Keith Thomas, Carlo Ginzburg, Jean Delumeau and Gerald Strauss, who specialized in the study of the early modern era, although representing different outlooks and coming from different intellectual traditions, led medievalists to cling to an almost unshakable conviction that the process of Christianization in the Middle Ages was quite superficial, and that it was not until the era of the Reformation and the resulting Catholic reform that Christianity managed to put down deeper roots.[10]

The appearance of *histoire nouvelle* in the 1970s, and the alluring confidence shown by the leaders of the *Annales* school in revolting against traditional historiography, made many feel obliged to adopt their vision of the past along with their methods of its study. In agreement with such attitudes was the conference, however insightful its results, organized by Bronisław Geremek in 1975: 'Elitist Culture versus Mass Culture in Poland in the late Middle Ages'.

Noteworthy is another presupposition underlying studies of popular culture (and religion). Although treated as an autonomous system, popular culture is seen to remain subject to influence or even pressure from the dominant elite culture — there is a specific time shift between the two, meaning that popular culture absorbs in a simplified way and with some delay elements of the elite worldview. This absorption notwithstanding, it is still affected by the previous, pagan system of culture. However, of key importance were the attempts to provide a definition of the 'people'. In terms of socio-economic divisions, it is a concept whose applicability is both chronologically and geographically very limited, and it needs to be precisely defined according to the region and period to which it is supposed to refer. When applied to medieval culture, it is blurred and imprecise: does it refer to the peasantry, to lower social groups in general, or to all lay people? Attempts were made to cope with this ambiguity by using other dichotomies: high culture (religion) — low culture (*illitterati* in Szulc's work); official — unofficial; the culture of the clergy and that of the laity; a decreed (*prescrite*) culture and that actually existing (*vécue*).[11] These dichotomies introduced a differentiation of cultural standards into socio-economic stratification. The standards, however, were drawn in so thick a line as to fail to grasp cultural differences between various estates and

[10] For the discussion of this research and of different positions see John van Engen, 'The Christian Middle Ages as an Historiographical Problem', *AHR*, 91, 1986, 3, pp. 519–52.

[11] For comparison see: Bernard Plongeron, 'La religion populaire: nouveau mythe de notre temps?', *Études*, 1978, pp. 535–48; Gabriele de Rosa, who also used this term and this opposition, stressed that popular religion, which he confined to forms of Catholic devotion, to the exclusion of its magical-pagan aspects, is not an autonomous concept which could be considered to indicate a religion distinctly different from an official one, see: Gabirele de Rosa, *Chiesa e religione popolare nel Mezzogiorno*, Bari, 1978.

milieus. What is more, the adoption of such an approach resulted in *a priori* definitions of the 'people' (laymen, *illitterati*) and its religion in opposition to the religion/piety of the clergy, or at best in considering the former as situated in the margins of the latter. This raised another problem — does one, in applying the concept of popular religion or religiosity to the system of beliefs and rituals typical of the laity and adopted by them from 'official' religion, actually refer it to their syncretic faith or to pastoral models intended for them?

This is an essential question which Szulc should have considered before she decided to define *a priori* the model of Observants' piety as one of mass religiosity (the religiosity of the unlearned). In the discussion of popular religion, which is to be understood here as both a concept and as an autonomous category, charges were raised that it became a hypostasis or that its use meant an ahistorical approach to the past. It also became clear that ideological preferences influenced the positions taken by those participating in the discussion.[12] Critiques of popular religion refused to accept the existence of a timeless religious system. Some regarded the concept as unclear, ahistorical, unsustainable, and called for it to be replaced with the concept of the struggle between the religion of the elite on one hand and that of the other social groups on the other.[13] A sociological interpretation of the history of religion (in this case, Christianity in the Middle Ages and in the early modern era), triumphant in the early 1960s, came to be increasingly criticized by scholars. This criticism was directed mainly against historians using language filled with the 'obsession of social determinants' and relying on anachronistic class divisions.[14]

In using the term mass religiosity or the narrower religiosity of *illitterati*, Szulc should offer a detailed characterization of the subject matter. With the mass religiosity model created and disseminated by *litterati* Observant Franciscans, coupled with a lack of significant evidence allowing us to reconstruct the way in which it was received and functioned from 'the nave's side', the very nature of the subject matter seems far from obvious. Szulc's introductory remarks, as well as the body of sources to which she turns, favour the conclusion that she is convinced of a dichotomy of the cultures and at least some autonomy of mass religiosity which — when one, like the proponents of the concept, takes this di-

[12] Antonio Gramsci's conceptualizations — those of popular Catholicism, religious folklore, and official religion represented by the Church — have had a great impact on Italian historiography. For more on the problem see: Vittorio Lanternari, 'La religion populaire. Prospective historique et anthropologique', *Archives de sciences sociales de religions*, 51, 1982, 1, pp. 121–43. In many studies that discuss the use of the concept of popular religion attention is paid to either the confessional (Catholic) or ideological (leftist) orientation of scholars.

[13] Compare: Carlo Ginzburg, 'Premessa giustificativa', *Religioni delle classe popolari, Quaderni storici*, 14, 1979, 41, pp. 393–97.

[14] See Danilo Zardin, 'La "religione popolare": interpretazioni storiografiche e ipotesi di ricerca', in *Arte, religione, comunità nell'Italia rinascimentale e barocca. Atti del convegno di studi sul Santuario della Beata Vergine dei Miracoli di Saronno*, ed. Lucia Saccardo and Danilo Zardin, Milan, 2000, pp. 3–23.

chotomy as a point of departure — is easier to define negatively. It is the religiosity which involves beliefs and practices that remain on the fringes of elite culture, or even beyond its boundaries. According to Alphonse Dupront, these practices do not assume the form of a specific doctrine, they do not depend for their existence on the Church, and they do not translate into a specific ethics. They involve magical thinking, superstitions, and demonology. In the first place, however, it is the cult of saints and relics, as well as pilgrimages and the belief in miracles that are regarded as constitutive elements of popular religiosity. Thus, the distinction between a popular and official religion pushes outside the framework of the latter many forms of piety which historians, often deluded by medieval zealots, regard as inconsistent with various dogmas and as falling outside a system of the 'learned' religion that can never be clearly defined.

This approach has proved a complete failure at every level of the opposition between the religion of the 'learned' and the faith of the 'idiots'. Treatises on superstitions, when examined by positivistically-minded historians relying on traditional methods and sceptical about methodological novelties, or by scholars representing different schools and capable of tracing intellectual origins, proved entirely the product of the 'learned'. Accounts of magical practices or a lingering faith in pagan gods found in these treatises, which allegedly originated in the observation of local customs or in the knowledge obtained by confessors, were quite often derived either from other treatises or from old penitentials that were never in use in a given area. A good example is the famous catalogue of magic ascribed to the Cistercian monk Rudolf. The belief in miracles, the zeal for pilgrimages, and the passion for the collecting of relics and indulgences were as common among Dominican theologians, bishops, and princes as they were among plebs to whom the learned directed their sermons. After all, prayers including spells were found in canonical hours prepared by educated clergymen for dukes and aristocrats living on top of the social ladder.

The problem of primary sources appears to be crucial in this model. If the research is from the very beginning based on the assumption that there is a clear opposition between the religion/religiosity of the clergy and elites and that of the masses, then one cannot leave unresolved the issue of their mutual relations, their interaction, or the processes of osmosis, friction or rejection occurring between the two systems. These relations are extremely difficult to grasp in the face of so depressing and inauspicious an asymmetry of primary sources typifying older periods. The history of failure that taints research into religious syncretism clearly urges caution here. An approach once adopted in folklore studies suggested that there was a top-down transfer between the two systems, from written to oral modes of communication. A fierce debate occurred on whether it could take place in the opposite direction. Advocates of interaction between the two systems were even able to indicate some specific examples and places of such a two-way movement — for instance, a monastery between a refectory and a kitchen. Opponents argued that written primary sources do not allow one to

prove that there existed a single belief or practice autonomously engendered within folk tradition. What was regarded as 'popular' or 'folk' as a rule turned out to be 'learned' and drawn from some text or other. A way out of the impasse may lie in the adoption of a new approach, one of reconstructing given systems in their entirety. Alphonse Dupront in an essay devoted to popular religion, suggested in presenting its phenomenological characterization, that it was fully integrated with the whole socio-economic existence of humanity.[15] Wojciech Brojer, who does not endorse the conception of popular religion, was more radical in formulating his own position. He has simply recognized all the beliefs and practices associated with popular religion as constituting part of a coherent worldview characterizing all members of a given cultural group.

There are primary sources clearly favoured by scholars involved in the study of popular or mass religion: sermons, *exempla*, devotional literature, confession books, inquisition and canonization records, *miracula*, and iconography. Such sources are also to be found in Szulc's book, although exceptions are materials relating to the inquisition, canonization and *miracula*. Most of the sources used in studies of popular religiosity and in Szulc's work had been known and available well before scholars began to examine this topic. However, since this material was produced by the clergy, who represented high culture, it presents historians with some specific methodological requirements, which make it necessary to define methodological problems likely to be encountered during the research. If the problems are not clearly expounded, they have to be at least easily identifiable in the analysis presented.

This pertains especially to presuppositions underlying the analysis, as well as to the methods used to penetrate beneath the learned text into the realm of a popular culture. The historian obtains the access to the first — the learned — text by decoding intellectual categories; while the second is grasped through questions and conceptualizations provided by cultural anthropology, comparative religious studies, structural analysis or perhaps through some vague notion of collective mentality. Szulc has refused to provide us with a discussion of the methodological problems which are of key importance for her studies. Undoubtedly, it is clear that Aron Gurevich's concepts had an impact on the structure of her work and the general subject of her research. Given the prestige enjoyed by the Russian scholar, such an impact can hardly come as a surprise. Szulc actually accepts his point of view: to get through to their audience, and it is to be regretted that we are not told anything about the audience, the texts to which she refers had to make use of a symbolic system the recipients would be familiar with. However, if this is the case then we are not confronting a clear or at least an essential (that is, accepted by the priesthood) distinction between the religiosity of the learned, the clergy, and that of *illitterati*, the laity; for both not only shared the same faith but also held the same worldview. This leads one

[15] It was published later along with other texts in a large volume entitled *Du sacré. Croisades et pèlerinages. Images et langages*, Paris, 1987.

to ask about the sources of this close relationship. For Gurevich this was the result of the 'folklorization' of the official religion, on one hand, and of the 'theologization' of a popular religion, on the other. One might say that the latter was becoming increasingly suffused with doctrinal thinking. Most scholars (Delaruelle, Dupront, Delumeau), even in the early stages of the field's development took a balanced position regarding these contradictions: distinctions were not clear-cut, both cultures (religions) permeated each other, and their interaction was characterized by specific dynamics.

Ambiguous concepts, often used with quotation marks (to which we can add *culture folklorique*), unclear conceptions, and doubt-provoking conceptualization led to popular religion becoming — especially in the 1970s — more the subject of an interesting discussion than a distinct field of study. For the studies that had actually been carried out, although representing high scholarly standards, opening up new fields of historical inquiry and extending the knowledge of medieval religious beliefs and rituals, did not produce a clear picture of the system of practices that could without doubt be termed popular or mass, as distinct from official and learned.

The interdisciplinary character of this field of research — the historiography began to draw on methods and approaches elaborated within ethnography, anthropology, sociology and comparative religious studies — led to a conceptual impasse once attempts to offer a phenomenological description of a socially imprecise popular piety were abandoned in favour of a systemic approach. Popular religion, it was realized, was extremely complex. Attempts to isolate it and grant it an autonomous status failed.

One reason for this failure was that scholars who dealt with popular religion as it existed in the Middle Ages remained for a long time indifferent to other medieval distinctions fundamental to this issue. Medieval writings are full of oppositions that set the clergy against the laity, the educated against the uneducated: *litterati — illitterati*, *docti — simplices*, *clerici — laici*, *spiritualia — temporalia*, *sacerdotium — regnum*. The definition and etymology of the word 'layman' found in *Catholikon* by Giovanni Balbi (Johannes Balbus) of Genoa is couched in brutal terms. The layman is *extraneus a scientia litterarum* and is also *laos* which is derived from *lapis* because, just like a stone, he is *durus*.[16] Earlier, Gratian's *Decretum* defined quite precisely the division of the Church. It consists of *duo genera Christianorum*. The first includes those who serve God (they are among the group of *regentes*). The second are *populus*, *laici*.[17] These distinctions, which are not tantamount to a dichotomous vision of the alternative cultures, collapse only in the later Middle Ages. However, two German authors, almost peers, adopted in the latter half of the fourteenth century different positions. For Konrad of Megenberg — *genus*

[16] Du Cange et al., *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, Niort, 1886, entry 'Laicus': 'Et dicitur a Laos, (λαός) Populus; vel potius a Laos (λᾶς, λᾶος) Lapis. Inde Laicus i. Lapideus; quia durus et extraneus a scientia litterarum'.

[17] *Decretum Gratiani*, c. XII, q. 1, c. 7.

laicorum, is *populus ignarus*.[18] Henry of Suso includes under the term *devotae personae* both those who are *doctae* as well as those who are *indoctae*.[19]

From the very beginning, the people of the Church realized that they had to fit their language to the audience they addressed. In the later Middle Ages they attempted to bridge the gap separating them from the 'plebs' by using a very effective tool — a vernacular language. They also took advantage of an increasing, especially in cities, level of literacy. Some failed. Meister Eckhart was charged with using too convoluted a language, while as Nicolas of Cusa wrote, people *intelligentes* could find in his writings *multa subtilia et utilia*.[20]

An awareness of the disconnection between faith and knowledge is to be found in the work of a variety of thinkers beginning with Saint Augustine through to Peter Lombard and to William of Ockham. Observant Franciscans worked and acted in a world which was familiar with the notion of unconscious faith, which may well have characterized pagans: *et fides implicita sufficit ad hoc quod aliquis sit catholicus et fidelis*.[21]

Szulc has managed to steer clear of many of these traps. She has simply failed to ask questions that need to be asked when one uses the category of 'mass religiosity'. She would have avoided further problems had she decided to follow the path taken in the 1980s by André Vauchez or by some English historians who distanced themselves from various works, often representing high scholarly standards, written by authors connected with the *Annales* school.[22] In recent years research has become increasingly focused on religious life. A way out of the problems of socio-cultural distinctions has been to make them more complex and better adjusted to some local cultural conditions — urban piety, rural piety, royal piety, and so on. British historians have set themselves the goal of presenting a coherent and comprehensive picture of spiritual life during the Middle Ages. In pursuit of this, they have concentrated either on the analysis of pilgrimages, viewed as an important and representative part of the life in question, or on the reconstruction of the religious outlook of the laity and its participation in liturgy in the period preceding the Reformation.[23] The concept of popular religion was no longer useful. It was replaced with the term 'traditional religion' which does not imply some artificial separateness from 'official

[18] Quotation from Klaus Schreiner, 'Laienfrömmigkeit — Frömmigkeit von Eliten oder Frömmigkeit des Volkes? Zur sozialen Verfaßtheit laikaler Frömmigkeitspraxis im späten Mittelalter', in *Laienfrömmigkeit im späten Mittelalter: Formen, Funktionen politisch-soziale Zusammenhänge*, ed. idem, Munich, 1992, p. 27.

[19] Cited after Georg Steer, 'Die deutsche "Rechtssumme" des Dominikaners Berthold — ein Dokument der spätmittelalterlichen Laienchristlichkeit', in *Laienfrömmigkeit im späten Mittelalter*, p. 235.

[20] Nicolai de Cusa, *Apologia doctae ignorantiae*, ed. Raymundus Klibansky, Hamburg, 2007, II, no. 36.

[21] William of Ockham, *Dialogus*, part 1, 4–3, 〈http://www.britac.ac.uk/pubs/dialogus/w1d4acl.html〉 [accessed 9 May 2013].

[22] See also Schreiner, 'Laienfrömmigkeit', pp. 1–78.

[23] Jonathan Sumption, *Pilgrimage: An Image of Mediaeval Religion*, London, 1975.

religion'.[24] It was concluded that a distinction between elitist and popular religions amounts to creating divisions that did not exist.[25]

In the 1980s the focus shifted elsewhere: to the religious message and its reception. The term popular religion came to be increasingly replaced with the concept of the religion of laymen, which highlights a more tangible distinction. It is a distinction between the Church that teaches and that which is taught. A vast area of the Church teaching was placed at the centre of interest. With the emphasis put on the teachings of the Church, on the ideas disseminated by religious culture, on the formation of the piety of the masses, and on religious acculturation, such an approach can clearly be seen in the work by Aleksandra Witkowska. In my opinion, she unnecessarily uses the term popular or mass religiosity, which is out of line with the reservations she herself makes. However, she does not rely on a dichotomy: the religiosity of the 'learned' (the clergy) and the piety of the 'masses'. This allows her to avoid many of the pitfalls of basing her research on the sources produced by the clergy. First, the sources were addressed to various groups. Second, and more important in this context, the religious attitudes of those who produced the sources were perhaps 'more conscious and more dependent on theological thought, but it is they who formed a popular religiosity'.[26]

Alicja Szulc seems to follow this path, dealing with the dissemination of a form of religiosity, which is unnecessarily called 'mass', by the intellectual elite of the clergy. However, she stops halfway, thus failing to give an account of the content of the form of religiosity and, first of all, to provide a collective portrait of its recipients. By cutting Polish Observant Franciscans off from the spirituality of the whole order (it is not to be forgotten that although Kapistran was the founder of the observant movement in Poland it was St Bernardino of Siena who remained its spiritual leader), she deprives us of the possibility of linking their teachings to processes with a broad geographical significance. In confining her account to the order's ministry, she fails to show the specificity of the

[24] Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England*, New Haven, CT, 1992.

[25] Robert N. Swanson, *Religion and Devotion in Europe, c. 1215–1515*, Cambridge, 1995; see also Carl Watkins, '"Folklore" and "Popular Religion" in Britain during the Middle Ages', *Folklore*, 115, 2004, 2, pp. 140–50, where a demand for studying 'local religious culture' in which the whole community — both elites and common people — participated is formulated.

[26] Witkowska, *Kulty pątnicze*, p. 172. It should also be noted that Witkowska, recognizing — like Delaruelle — the enormous significance of the ongoing late medieval process of Christianization, the increasingly religious character of private and social life, the interiorization of religious content and models, does not — unlike the French historian — accentuate the opposition between the piety of the clergy and that of the 'people'. At the same time Delaruelle regarded *la piété populaire*, the collective forms and bases of piety, deriving, for example from the particular mental structures and psychological characteristics (emotionality) ascribed to the 'people' as the essence of medieval religious life. Naturally enough, he cast St Francis of Assisi in the role of mediator between these two types of piety.

'Bernardine' model of religiosity and to place it in a wider local religious culture. She also does not take into account the obvious conclusion, which is also supported by her own study, namely that the liturgy served as the basis of this teaching. It was the elementary school in which a Christian was to be formed. The school, it needs to be emphasized, was the same for everyone regardless of one's social background and cultural standards. Some made greater and some lesser use of it, but it was attended by everyone at the same time. I would like to know what the Polish Observants' version of this school was.

(Translated by Artur Mękarski)

Summary

This paper discusses the use of the concept and model of 'popular religion' in the Polish studies on religious life in the late Middle Ages. Reviewing the book on pastoral work of the first generations of Observant Franciscans in Poland on the one hand (Alicja Szulc, *Homo religiosus późnego średniowiecza. Bernardyński model religijności masowej / Homo religiosus of the late middle ages. The Bernardine's model of popular religion*, Poznań 2007, pp. 256), and summarizing debates related to this concept on the other, it stresses the need to work out a new research approach to analysing late medieval religious phenomena and practices. Polish studies in the regard should focus more on the concept of 'the religion of laymen', and emphasize a distinction between the Church that teaches and that which is taught.

Halina Manikowska

Kwartalnik Historyczny
Vol. CXXI, 2014
Special Issue, pp. 169–188
PL ISSN 0023-5903

RICHARD BUTTERWICK-PAWLIKOWSKI
School of Slavonic and East European Studies,
University College London

A DIALOGUE OF REPUBLICANISM AND LIBERALISM: REGARDING ANNA GRZEŚKOWIAK-KRWAWICZ'S BOOK ON THE IDEA OF LIBERTY

Regina Libertas[1] is the magnificent culmination of the research that Professor Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz has conducted for many years on Polish political thought in the eighteenth century. This research has already yielded numerous and valuable publications — books, articles, lectures and source-editions — some of which have appeared in English and French. As the author informs us, some of these earlier works have been reused in modified form in this book. Her deep knowledge of the field is reflected in the construction of the monograph. It is not divided by the criteria of political camps, social categories or — with one justified exception — period. The book consists of seven parts, of which four are divided into eleven chapters. This arrangement may sound complicated, but it does not in practice disturb the reader. It is precisely thought-out. The 'heroine' of the book is the concept of liberty, which is analysed from various perspectives and at several levels. With impressive ease and grace Grześkowiak-Krwawicz leaps from author to author, choosing telling quotations to illustrate her theses, without unnecessary repetitions. She wears her extraordinary erudition lightly, so that it neither overwhelms nor intimidates the reader. The book is written in elegant and accessible Polish. The author subtly encourages the reader to ask questions, which she then answers, inviting the next question in turn. This is a kind of dialogue between the author and the reader, whom the author treats as a companion in her journey into the past. This review article is an acceptance of that invitation to enter into dialogue with the author. For this reason the reader is asked graciously to forgive the too frequent citations of my own work.

[1] Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz, *Regina libertas. Wolność w polskiej myśli politycznej XVIII wieku*, Gdańsk, 2006, Wydawnictwo słowo/obraz terytoria, pp. 515.

The theses advanced by Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz would be worth the closest attention even if they were not presented in such an accessible manner. Polish historiography is adorned by such experts on eighteenth-century political thought as Władysław Konopczyński, Henryk Olszewski, Emanuel Rostworowski, Jerzy Michalski, Zofia Zielińska and Jerzy Lukowski. Most historians have long since freed themselves from the vision of the history of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as a particular, anarchic and 'Sarmatian' path to partition and perdition. For more than a century, a kind of consanguinity has been noted between Polish thinkers and such luminaries as Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Charles-Louis de Montesquieu, Benjamin Franklin and Edmund Burke. Nobody would deny the Euro-Atlantic world's shared rhetorical roots in classical antiquity. However, until now nobody has tried to write the key concept of early modern Polish political thought into the common history of Europe.

For more than twenty years, researchers of early modern European republicanism, led by Quentin Skinner and John G. A. Pocock, have focused their attention on the republican theory of liberty. The republican idea of freedom differs from the liberal concept of freedom in that it is not satisfied by the condition in which man may — for the moment — freely dispose of his person and property because of the absence of coercion. Unlike the liberal concept, the old republican idea of liberty does not appeal to natural law. The conviction of the natural right of every human being to freedom powerfully influenced the evolution of the concept of liberty in the eighteenth century. For early modern republicans, it was axiomatic that a man may be truly free only in a 'free state', that is, one in which the single ruler — the monarch — cannot in tyrannical fashion impose his will on his subjects, because as citizens they participate in the exercise of power. This is not a rejection of 'negative liberty' in favour of 'positive liberty', as later liberal theorists would have put it, but rather the conviction that the first concept of liberty depends on the second. Our own times have seen the 'excavation' of the republican idea of freedom and its recommendation as an alternative to nineteenth- and twentieth-century liberalism.[2]

Using the arguments presented in *Regina libertas*, a strong case could made that the theoretical foundations for research on early modern republicanism fit the constitutional conditions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth even better than those in England, the Dutch Republic or the Italian city-states. Polish theorists only began to distinguish clearly between 'civil' (negative) and

[2] For example: Quentin Skinner, *Liberty before Liberalism*, Cambridge, 1998; idem, 'A Third Concept of Liberty', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 117, 2002, pp. 237–68. See Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz, 'Quentin Skinner i teoria wolności republikańskiej', *Archiwum Filozofii i Myśli Społecznej*, 4, 2000, pp. 165–74; Bogdan Szlachta, 'Wolność republikańska. Na marginesie debaty o tradycji republikańskiej w "atlantyckiej" myśli politycznej', *Państwo i Społeczeństwo*, 1, 2001, 1, pp. 207–32. Cf. Isaiah Berlin, 'Two Concepts of Liberty', in idem, *Four Essays on Liberty*, Oxford, 1969, pp. 118–72.

'political' (positive) liberty in the last three or four decades of the eighteenth century. Even then, they very rarely placed the two concepts in mutual opposition — although such exceptions, such as Reverend Hieronym Stroynowski and Józef Pawlikowski from one side, and Reverend Stanisław Staszic from the other, were important. Significant in Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz's efforts to write the history of Polish republican thought into European history was her active participation in the important programme, financed by the European Union and directed by Quentin Skinner and Martin van Gelderen — *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage* — which bore fruit in two volumes with the same title. Similarly pertinent is her organization of a conference in Warsaw for the International Society of Eighteenth-Century Studies with the notable title *Liberté: Héritage du Passé ou Idée des Lumières?*[3] It is not surprising, therefore, that she displays an easy mastery of the French- and especially the abundant English-language scholarly literature on early modern republicanism.

With regard to Polish political thought, the author reaches back deep into the seventeenth and sixteenth centuries, using both literature and sources. It seems to this reviewer (although specialists on earlier periods will know better) that modesty dictated the apparent limitation of the scope of the book to the eighteenth century. The book's title is itself derived from a treatise written in the seventeenth century, *Domina palatii regina libertas*, which was reissued several times in the following century (p. 9). Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century writers such as Andrzej Maksimilian Fredro, Łukasz Górnicki, Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski, Łukasz Opaliński, Szymon Starowolski and Jan Zamoyski are often cited, as are anonymous authors of shorter works, especially from the period of the Zebrzydowski rebellion (1606–09). Grześkowiak-Krwawicz cites experts on these questions, including Anna Sucheni-Grabowska, Janusz Tazbir, Stefania Ochmann-Staniszewska, Zbigniew Ogonowski, Urszula Augustyniak, Jerzy Urwanowicz and Edward Opaliński (who was also a participant in the programme *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage*).[4] It should be noted, however, that she rarely conducts polemics with other historians. She invites others to enter into discussion with her, but she is not insistent. Had she done otherwise, the notes, which are already extensive, would have taken on gigantic dimensions. Instead of such polemics, the introduction and the first part of the book, 'The eighteenth century: old and new freedom?', set out her programme fully.

---

[3] Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz, 'Anti-Monarchism in Polish Republicanism in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', in *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage*, ed. Martin van Gelderen and Quentin Skinner, 2 vols, Cambridge, 2002, vol. 1, pp. 43–59; eadem, 'Deux libertés, l'ancienne et la nouvelle, dans la pensée politique polonaise du XVIII^{e} siècle', in *Liberté: Héritage du Passé ou Idée des Lumières? / Freedom: Heritage of the Past or an Idea of the Enlightenment?*, ed. Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz and Izabella Zatorska, Kraków and Warsaw, 2003, pp. 44–59.

[4] Edward Opaliński, 'Civic Humanism and Republican Citizenship in the Polish Renaissance', in *Republicanism: A Shared European Heritage*, vol. 1, pp. 147–67.

In the conceptual foundations of her work, Grześkowiak-Krwawicz lays more emphasis on the *longue durée* of the early modern Polish and republican idea of liberty over a period of three centuries than on changes in its understanding during the second half of the eighteenth century. She writes about those changes, but in almost every case she finds and underlines elements of traditional thinking about freedom. Let us take Reverend Hugo Kołłątaj as an example. Convinced as he was of the natural right of (almost) every man to liberty, Kołłątaj reversed the usual relationship between political and civil freedom — for him the former depended on the latter. Yet he did not break with the republican attachment to a 'free state' in which citizens participated in government. This continuity testifies, according to the author, that the early modern idea of liberty did not undergo petrification, but was instead able to adapt to new circumstances and challenges. In this regard Grześkowiak-Krwawicz belongs to the increasingly numerous historians who 'optimistically' interpret the history, values and heritage of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. She is not, however, a naive apologist who aims to 'rehabilitate' early modern Polish republicanism. She explicitly distances herself from such a position. She seeks to explain, not to judge. It should be noted, however, that she hopes that better understanding of the former idea of liberty in Poland will lead readers away from negative stereotypes on the subject.

For this reason Grześkowiak-Krwawicz carefully avoids the adjective 'Sarmatian' (*sarmacki*). The term has acquired too many pejorative connotations to be useful as a label for the main tendency of Polish political thought between the sixteenth and the eighteenth century. If she uses it at all, she does so in strictly defined meanings and contexts. I should add here, that the emotion-laden 'rehabilitation' of 'Sarmatism' attempted by some historians and researchers in 'cultural studies' also hinder the use of the word 'Sarmatian' as a epithet in serious academic research.[5] The author prefers the adjective *staropolski* (literally 'old-Polish', but translated here as 'early modern Polish') in order to emphasize the traditional character of republican thought in this period. This preference may be debatable, but — unlike a previous reviewer — I would also incline towards Grześkowiak-Krwawicz's solution. The use of 'Sarmatian', 'Sarmatia' and 'Sarmatism' (or 'Sarmatianism') is helpful only when these terms are used in the sources in question.[6]

According to Grześkowiak-Krwawicz, one of the reasons for the insufficient attention paid hitherto to elements of continuity in Polish political thought has been historians' concentration on the most illustrious writers, above all on Stanisław Dunin Karwicki, Stanisław Leszczyński/Mateusz Białłozor, Reverend Stanisław Konarski, Józef Wybicki, Reverend Hugo Kołłątaj, Reverend Stanisław Staszic and Józef Pawlikowski, at the expense of authors belonging to the cate-

[5] E.g. Stanisław Grzybowski, *Sarmatyzm*, in the series *Dzieje narodu i państwa polskiego*, vol. 2, no. 26, Kraków, 1996.

[6] See Maciej Parkitny's review of *Regina Libertas* in *Wiek Oświecenia*, 23, 2007, pp. 268–69.

gory '*minorum gentium*' (p. 13), such as Reverend Walenty Pęski, to whom is ascribed the treatise *Domina palatii regina libertas*. She argues that emphasizing novelty rather than continuity leads to the distortion of the thought of writers associated with 'turning points' and the neglect of other authors. She postulates research on a wider range of writings — less original or notable from the perspective of posterity, but more representative of the political thought of the period studied. Here Grześkowiak-Krwawicz approaches Anglophone historians, such as Harry T. Dickinson, who is quoted at the beginning of the introduction (p. 5), in order to convince the reader of the sense of her research: 'If [...] we wish to make sense of the political actions and agents of any past society, then we need to recognize the political values of that society and understand what the society or sections of it admired and condemned.'[7]

At this point it is worth explaining that this sentence is part of Dickinson's argument, following in the footsteps of Quentin Skinner, against the followers of Sir Lewis Bernstein Namier (who was sceptically disposed to the possibility that any ideology could influence the practice of politics and who in his research focused on the details of the material interests and family connections of people engaged in political activity).[8] Grześkowiak-Krwawicz does not transpose this polemic to Polish historiography. She writes with the utmost respect of scholars such as Zofia Zielińska and Wojciech Kriegseisen who have drawn back the curtain of rhetoric to reveal the off-stage machinations of Polish political life in the eighteenth century. Without in any way negating such achievements or their underlying conceptual assumptions, she conveys to the reader that she is dealing with another political plane.

Grześkowiak-Krwawicz adopts a similar stance towards research on the political culture of the Commonwealth and its dominant noble estate — the *szlachta*. It could be argued, following the line taken by Dickinson and Skinner, that in order to establish the ideological or rhetorical boundaries of the politically permissible or possible, or to identify the positions, which bring a politician the greatest popularity, research on the frequency and contexts of the key slogans repeated in the given political culture is essential.[9] The author quotes further fragments of Dickinson's arguments on page 361, footnote 10. She herself declares on page 251: 'Even these empty declamations deserve closer interest. Although they were repeated more or less automatically, without any deeper political thought, they nevertheless reflected a coherent and long established theory of liberty'. The full realization of such a programme would require the immensely time-consuming

[7] H. T. Dickinson, *Liberty and Property. Political Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Britain*, London, 1977, p. 6.

[8] Quentin Skinner, 'The Principles and Practices of Opposition: The Case of Bolingbroke versus Walpole', in *Historical Perspectives: Studies in English Thought and Society*, ed. Neil McKendrick, London, 1974, pp. 93–128.

[9] I expand on this theme in 'Political Discourses of the Polish Revolution, 1788–92', *EHR*, 120, 2005, pp. 695–731.

study of countless instructions acclaimed by the sejmiks (or dietines — the local assemblies of the nobility), parliamentary speeches, sermons, poems, occasional speeches and so on, not to mention the interpretation of works of art and architecture. Answers to many particular problems would require the study of private correspondence (Grześkowiak-Krwawicz does this on page 327 and elsewhere). The task would be fully achievable only for a much shorter time span. Nevertheless, a book of this kind, based on such a conceptual framework has been written — for an earlier and somewhat shorter period — by Edward Opaliński. It has been widely acclaimed as a model of its type.[10] We shall shortly discover the harvest of Jerzy Lukowski's research on the political culture of the eighteenth century. He could not be accused of ignoring continuities or omitting mediocre authors. But it would be equally difficult to convict him of sympathy towards early modern Polish political thought (with the exception of Reverend Konarski).[11]

Grześkowiak-Krwawicz distances herself from postulates to prioritize research on the political culture or mentality of the *szlachta*, in order to concentrate on political thought. Admittedly, she sometimes quotes a parliamentary speech, a sermon, or, in the seventh part of the book, a proclamation, but in general her sources are pamphlets and treatises of a political character. She wishes to understand key principles, not to delve into the circumstances in which those principles took rhetorical form. This in turn allows her to avoid the potential criticism, that she views the early modern Polish world through rose-tinted lenses. On the contrary, she repeats that, especially in the Saxon period (1697–1763), practice could depart markedly from theory. She argues, however, that discovering the values contained within political thought is a necessary step towards the understanding of the society in question. Such values, moreover, are more clearly exposed in political thought than in political culture. The novelty here lies not in the use of new kinds of sources, but in the refusal to disregard *a priori* those theoretical works (that is, those belonging to the sphere of political thought rather than political culture) which contributed no new ideas or proposals. In the end Grześkowiak-Krwawicz manages gracefully to balance on her tightrope; on the one hand she might be accused of writing only about an elite plane of thought, which had nothing in common with dirty and ugly political practice; on the other she might fall into a vast swamp, from which it would be difficult to discern any

[10] Edward Opaliński, *Kultura polityczna szlachty polskiej w latach 1587–1652*, Warsaw, 1995, reviewed, *inter alia*, by Juliusz Bardach (*PH*, 86, 1995, 2, pp. 238–41).

[11] See Jerzy Łukowski, 'Od Konarskiego do Kołłątaja — czyli od realizmu do utopii', in *Trudne stulecia. Studia z dziejów XVII i XVIII wieku ofiarowane Profesorowi Jerzemu Michalskiemu*, ed. Łukasz Kądziela, Wojciech Kriegseisen and Zofia Zielińska, Warsaw, 1994, pp. 184–94; idem, 'The Szlachta and Their Ancestors in the Eighteenth Century', *KH*, 111, 2004, 3, pp. 161–82. Lukowski's estimable monograph *Disorderly Liberty: The Political Culture of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the Eighteenth Century*, London, 2010, was published after the Polish original of this review article went to press. I reviewed it in *SEER*, 89, 2011, 3, pp. 562–64.

of the elevating principles of freedom. These principles are however visible from an avian perspective.

The second part of the book, titled 'Whence came liberty?', develops and explains one of the crucial themes of the first part. It contains two concise chapters: 'The history of Polish liberty' and 'Liberty as a gift of nature'. The author notes the very down-to-earth manner in which early modern Poles wrote about freedom, regardless of whether they believed it to have been graciously bestowed on their nation by kings, or instead to be timeless in its origin, but regained by the nobility from royal usurpations. They were concerned by specific constituents of a 'free [system of] government' — the privileges of Košice (Kassa, 1374) and Nieszawa (1454), *nihil novi* (1505), the elective throne, the supreme tribunals — which the *szlachta* had inherited from its forbears. Significantly, they rarely mentioned *neminem captivabimus nisi iure victum* — this privilege, which took shape during the 1420s and 1430s, was a quintessentially individual freedom. Changes came towards the end of the eighteenth century, when critically disposed writers created alternative narrations of Polish history — downward spirals of 'anarchy' or 'slavery'. This change was linked to an increase of interest in natural law under the influence of Enlightenment currents, especially Physiocratism. Its consequence was the increasing attention given to the peasant question. Even such a conservative writer as Michał Wielhorski — notably in the course of and following his dialogue with Gabriel Mably and Jean-Jacques Rousseau — had to acknowledge the axiom of the natural gift of freedom: he rather weakly explained that the services performed by the knights of old justified the exclusion of the common folk from liberty. Grześkowiak-Krwawicz underlines the significance of the 'typical philosophical concept' of liberty as a natural gift in the growing calls at the end of the eighteenth century to extend freedom beyond the noble estate (p. 82).

'Pillars of freedom' is the third and longest part of the book. It contains four chapters. In the first of these, 'Liberty and law', Grześkowiak-Krwawicz presents the cult of law and in particular — old laws. The conviction that, '*lex regnat, non rex*' (p. 87) was one of the fundamental elements of the constitution of the Commonwealth, as demonstrated by a range of quotations from the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Poles did not need John Locke (quoted at the beginning of the chapter) to persuade them that without laws, there can be no liberty. However, whereas in the liberal theory, laws protect freedom, in the republican theory of liberty laws protect the free Commonwealth which in turn guards the liberties of citizens. Some authors even discerned the true sovereign in these laws. Most importantly, the king was subjected to the laws. The cult of old laws was extraordinarily strong. For several generations the conviction that it was not necessary to create new laws, but only to execute the old ones, went virtually unchallenged. However, in the last decades of the eighteenth century some authors, most bluntly Józef Wybicki, did not hesitate to state that new situations require new laws. Grześkowiak-Krwawicz emphasizes, however, that these authors generally attacked the cult

of old laws from republican positions — new, good laws should protect 'the political existence, the external independence and the internal freedom of the nation', as the preamble to the Constitution of 3 May 1791 declared.

In the second half of the eighteenth century more emphasis was laid on the role of law in defending citizens from their fellow citizens. Although Grześkowiak-Krwawicz detects the influence of Western European theories here, especially on the learned Piarists (Fathers Wincenty Skrzetuski, Antoni Popławski and Konstanty Bogusławski), she draws attention to the fact that this problem had already been noted in the second half of the sixteenth century. It was constantly present in early modern Polish political writing, although it was less prominent between the middle of the seventeenth and the middle of the eighteenth century. For the essential function of law was to restrain licence. Laws should moderate liberty, and educate free men to make good use of their liberty. Because laws were made by citizens, disobedience to the laws had far worse effects in a free state than in a monarchy. However, the author argues that the use of law to impose far-reaching restrictions on individual freedoms, advised by Rousseau and propagated by Staszic and others, never met with widespread acceptance. She quotes Jan Ferdynand Nax's telling critique of Staszic, in order to contrast the latter's extreme interpretation of republican liberty with the position of the former, which was close to liberal concepts (p. 104).

The long and crucial chapter, 'Liberty and power, or nothing concerning us without us', provides further perspectives on the guiding principle of the republican idea of freedom: that citizens' participation in the exercise of power protects the liberty of individual citizens from the monarch. Again, she chooses quotations from three centuries to demonstrate the continuity of this principle. In the words of Adam Wawrzyniec Rzewuski, 'everyone governs and everyone is governed' (p. 109). This principle was expressed in the *pacta conventa* concluded with each newly elected king, which tangibly implemented the idea of the social contract well before the theories of Locke and Rousseau were written. With the passing of time, noble ideologists ceased to speak or write of the participation of the 'knightly estate' in the exercise of power, consigning the entirety of sovereignty to the noble nation. In the first half of the eighteenth century this supremacy of the 'nation' was supposed rather to protect old laws — protecting liberty — than to make new ones. The author suggests that later, especially during the Four Years Sejm of 1788–92, foreign authorities (especially Rousseau) encased the old conviction of the sovereignty of the nation in a shiny new frame. In my view, she might in this place (at least in a footnote) have clarified her position *vis-à-vis* Lukowski's argument (which partly descends from Reverend Walerian Kalinka and Konopczyński) that Rousseau played the key role in dynamizing Polish republicanism: from a basically passive ideology it became an active one. To some, that was a threatening development.[12]

[12] Łukowski, 'Od Konarskiego do Kołłątaja', passim. Cf. idem, 'Political Ideas among the Polish Nobility in the Eighteenth Century (to 1788)', *SEER*, 82, 2004, 1, pp. 1–26.

The fear of the omnipotence of the sejm had in any case much older origins than the Four Years Sejm. Theorists and pamphleteers had long since argued over the proper relations between the sejm and the sejmiks, before the Constitution of 3 May 1791 resolved the dispute by declaring the envoys to the sejm 'representatives of the entire nation' — rather than delegates bound by the instructions given to them by their sejmiks. According to Grześkowiak-Krwawicz, 'In the years 1788–90 visions of a sovereign sejm as the highest legislative organ and at the same time the guarantor of freedom were very rare' (pp. 120–21). She is probably correct regarding the pamphlets and other writings addressed to the wider 'public', which was mostly, but not exclusively, composed of noblemen. However, within the sejm many declamations were made of the sovereign power of the Commonwealth, as constituted in the deliberating estates of the sejm. This principle was proclaimed by such orators as Wojciech Suchodolski and Stanisław Kublicki, and in turn provoked warnings against the 'despotism' of the Commonwealth.[13] The author is surely right, however, to note that in 1791–92 the concept of direct democracy at the level of the sejmiks was decidedly rejected only after the most 'enlightened' politicians (who professed a distinctly 'republican' creed) had suffered a setback at the sejmiks held in November 1790 — and so within the sphere of practical politics.

Grześkowiak-Krwawicz considers the *liberum veto* in the context of the problem of whether sovereign power belonged to the entire 'nation' or to each and every individual citizen. Eighteenth-century writers were divided on this question, but gradually the first interpretation came to prevail. The author links the second interpretation with the principle of equality among noble citizens. She shows that whereas in the seventeenth century the *liberum veto* developed from the idea of unanimity in decision-making, in the first half of the eighteenth century it was the right of an individual to oppose everything 'that could harm liberty' (the words of Szczepan Sienicki, quoted on p. 129) that came to the fore. New laws, but above all the actions of the king, could harm freedom. This threat necessitated the *liberum veto*, according to its numerous supporters. Criticism of those using the *veto* was always abundant. Even fervent apologists for the *veto* displayed mixed feelings regarding its all too frequent abuse (Reverend Pęski compared such a condition of liberty to Purgatory, which was at least better than the Hell of slavery). However, it was only Reverend Konarski who 'magisterially [demonstrated] the contradiction between the *ius vetandi* and liberty on both levels' — positive and negative (p. 133). As the author frames the argument, Konarski's demolition of the theoretical justification of the *liberum veto* was a return to key principles of republicanism, which had been somewhat forgotten in

[13] Cf., for example, Richard Butterwick, 'O ratunek Ojczyzny. Sprawa opodatkowania duchowieństwa katolickiego w początkach Sejmu Czteroletniego', in *Spory o państwo w dobie nowożytnej. Między racją stanu a partykularyzmem*, ed. Zbigniew Anusik, Łódź, 2007, pp. 237–40.

the intervening generations: without a free, independent and strong Fatherland, there could be no liberty for its citizens.

Even Konarski, however, was unable to persuade his compatriots to abandon the principle of unanimity completely. Grześkowiak-Krwawicz makes the important argument that the continuing popularity of the principle of unanimity in later eighteenth-century Poland was, at least regarding the most important laws,[14] 'in some measure' a return to a sixteenth-century tradition, which arose from the fear 'no longer of the despotism of an individual, but of the tyranny of the majority' (p. 139). This is not stated explicitly, but the author appears to be referring to an aphorism from one of liberalism's canonical texts, John Stuart Mill's *On Liberty* (1859).[15] This would be another element of a specifically Polish synthesis between republicanism and the precursors of liberalism, but also part of a dialogue conducted by the author with the liberal tradition of thinking about liberty. She closes this chapter by returning to the question of 'freedom old and new' at the end of the eighteenth century, stating: 'The traditional republican conviction that participation "in government" is the guarantee of all freedoms, showed its enduring power; it was shared even by authors who proposed a modern division of liberty and who devoted much attention to civil liberty' (p. 141).

In the chapter 'A free voice securing freedom' (the title of a prominent work ascribed to Stanisław Leszczyński) Grześkowiak-Krwawicz discusses the meanings attached to one of the crucial principles of liberty from the end of the sixteenth century onwards. Initially this concerned the free speech of a citizen at a sejmik or the sejm, so that he might warn his fellow citizens of the monarch's designs against liberty. The scope of the principle was later widened to include printed material. To speak freely was, perhaps even more than an individual right, a patriotic duty. It was only towards the end of the eighteenth century, in certain justifications of the freedom of thought and of the press, that Enlightenment influences can be detected. In the last years of the Commonwealth, the possible dangers flowing from the abuse of freedom of expression were analysed and the permissible boundaries of that freedom were debated. It would perhaps have been worthwhile to have underlined the distinction signalled on pages 158–59 between the free voice in political matters and freedom of expression in questions of religion. Whereas the first right (between the reign of Stefan Batory in 1576–86 and the confederacy of Targowica in 1792–93) was an inviolable foundation of republican liberty, only a few declared their opposition — in principle — to ecclesiastical censorship of works that were potentially harmful to religion and morals. I would however question the author's statement that 'clergymen's demands provoked few polemics

[14] On this question cf. Jerzy Lukowski, '"Machines of Government": Replacing the Liberum Veto in the Eighteenth-Century Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth', *SEER*, 90, 2012, 1, pp. 65–97.

[15] Cf. J. S. Mill, *On Liberty and Other Writings*, ed. Stefan Collini, Cambridge, 1989, p. 8.

and it can be concluded that they arose rather on the margins of the discussion of freedom of expression' (p. 159). It is the case that in these polemics something other than the traditional 'free voice' was at issue. However these polemics, for example between Reverend Karol Wyrwicz and Reverend Piotr Świtkowski, Reverend Wojciech Skarszewski and Jan Baudouin de Courtenay, Reverend Stefan Łuskina and the editors and publishers of *Gazeta Narodowa i Obca*, or Reverend Karol Surowiecki and numerous adversaries, were heated, and they echoed loudly at the time.[16] It is another matter that in practice ecclesiastical censorship functioned weakly, if at all.

The chapter 'Liberty and equality' acquaints us with the role of the idea, or rather the myth, of equality within the noble estate as a guarantor of freedom. For many writers from the sixteenth to the end of the eighteenth century, equality among citizens replaced the function of strong royal power in securing to the nobleman 'the tranquil possession, without fear', of his property. Civic equality remained in a certain tension with the vision of the Commonwealth as a *monarchia mixta*, in which senators were supposed to hold the balance between *maiestas* and *libertas*. Demagogic attacks on the magnates, as the author writes, had a long tradition. It was, however, only towards the end of the eighteenth century that such attacks contributed to essential changes, both in political practice and in thinking about liberty. The key element in the campaign of late eighteenth-century royalists to restore to the monarch his lost prerogatives (and in some cases, to establish a significantly stronger executive power) was the convincing of their listeners and readers that equality was merely a myth that veiled an oligarchy of the richest and most powerful. Their success was facilitated by the increasing economic, social, cultural and political importance of the middling nobility during the reign of King Stanisław August Poniatowski (1764–95). Another reason for their success was that 'as early as the 1770s, in Polish political theory the old concept of a mixed form of government was rejected and replaced by modern constitutional constructions, in which "the third force" of the aristocracy was not only superfluous, but positively dangerous' (p. 180). The Four Years Sejm saw the reduction of the role of the senate. It was also at this time that landless nobles were stripped of their (theoretically) equal participation in the exercise of power. This step was intended to curtail the licence of the magnates, but it was at odds with the canon of noble values and with the privileged position of the *szlachta* with regard to other social estates. However, the question of equality (in its constitutional and legal aspects) was not debated in relation to burghers; with regard to peasants such a discussion would have been unthinkable.

The fourth part of the book is titled 'Liberty in peril' and has three chapters. The first of these deals with the most obvious danger: 'The king lies in wait for liberty'. The author reminds us that this conviction 'was not merely a phobia among nobles' and did not only derive from observations of the

[16] Cf., for example, Władysław Smoleński, *Przewrót umysłowy w Polsce wieku XVIII*, 4th edn, Warsaw, 1979, chapters 8 and 9.

deeds of foreign monarchs who successively overthrew liberty, and 'a little' from experiences of the Commonwealth's own kings. It also had theoretical foundations reaching back to classical Antiquity, which were 'common to all European thought about the state' (p. 189). It was not only the Polish nobility that feared its kings, and it was not only in the Commonwealth that people feared the degeneration of the state into anarchy or tyranny. In Poland, however, the typical sixteenth- and seventeenth-century conviction of the delicate but necessary balance *inter maiestatem ac libertatem* began at the start of the eighteenth century to give way to the 'republicanization' of the constitution (or at least to the 'republicanization' of discourse about the form of government), a tendency that proceeded simultaneously with the loss of faith in the optimal qualities of *monarchia mixta*. To a considerable extent this programme was implemented in the 1770s, when Stanisław August lost most of his prerogatives of distribution and nomination. However, the 'granting' to the king of executive power in the form of the Permanent Council established in 1775 provoked considerable mistrust, despite the fact that in accordance with the proposals of Konarski and others, the principle of collegiality was applied and the Council was subordinated to the sejm. Any influence wielded by the executive power or the monarch on the legislature and the judicial power raised particular hackles. This testifies to the asymmetrical and selective reception in Polish thought of Montesquieu's concept of the triune division of powers.

On the other hand, this republican programme — depriving the monarch of power and turning him into the country's highest official and the guardian of national sovereignty — prepared the path for the supplanting of free royal elections by hereditary succession to the throne. Grześkowiak-Krwawicz stresses, however, that this was a long road, and not one taken by all. She also discerns that among supporters of free royal elections a shift in emphasis took place, from the accentuation of the positive role of elections in cleansing and renewing the free Commonwealth towards ever more frightful warnings against hereditary kings. In the end, but only in the end, a few of the most consequential republicans proposed an 'eternal interregnum' (p. 213). Deep-rooted distrust of any kind of royal power was voiced in the furious criticism of the Constitution of 3 May 1791 by its opponents.

For many historians, especially those of a somewhat 'pessimist' persuasion, the struggle *inter maiestatem ac libertatem* is the main axis of the history of the Commonwealth.[17] It was not, however, the only source of peril. The chapter 'Liberty as a threat to liberty' presents evidence that early modern Polish political thought by no means underestimated the possibility that *libertas* might degenerate into *licentia*, although the frequency with which the adjective *periculosa* was joined to the noun *libertas* suggests that 'often there seemed to be no remedy for [the danger]'. The author then states firmly that Poles forgot to post the neces-

[17] For example: Jerzy Lukowski, 'The Szlachta and the Monarchy: Reflections on the Struggle inter maiestatem ac libertatem', in *The Polish-Lithuanian Monarchy in European Context, c. 1500–1795*, ed. Richard Butterwick, Basingstoke, 2001, pp. 132–49.

sary guards around liberty (pp. 216–17). She then considers the important problem of *nierząd* (literally — the absence of government or more loosely — misrule) which is sometimes mistaken for *swawola* (licence) or — as in the later eighteenth century — with *anarchia* (anarchy). In the seventeenth century *nierząd* was associated with the disorder that was unavoidable in a free state. *Swawola* on the other hand was always — however ineffectively — condemned. From the middle of the eighteenth century, however, *anarchia* and *nierząd* were usually treated as synonyms for a catastrophic actual state of affairs which contradicted liberty and threatened the further existence of the state. This change was linked to the conviction that it no longer sufficed to correct morals, it was necessary to change institutions and laws. Calls for a return to ancestral virtues began to give way to charges against the noble nation's forbears, who were sometimes accused of mistaking 'licence for liberty' (p. 226, a quotation from the pamphlet *Suum cuique*, circa 1771). In order to demonstrate the significance of this change, Grześkowiak-Krwawicz manages to show empathy with Hetman Seweryn Rzewuski, who as early as 1776 lamented that 'for no little time they have been trying to call *rząd* (government) everything that would bring us closer to despotism, and *nierząd* (anarchy), noise and confusion, everything which secured the noble freedom of citizens' (pp. 227–28). I would add that this change in the discourse of 'government' and 'anarchy', which yielded the slogan *rządna wolność* (orderly freedom), was strongly expressed at and by the sejmiks which in February 1792 welcomed the Constitution of 3 May.[18]

The chapter 'The external threat, or liberty and independence' follows on naturally. This problem has been critical to the evaluation of the Commonwealth in virtually the whole of Polish historiography since the nineteenth century. Grześkowiak-Krwawicz endeavours to look at this problem without the prism of the partitions. She seeks to enable the reader to understand the roots of such shocking statements (from a later perspective) as, for example, that of an envoy to the Four Years Sejm, Jan Krasiński: 'It should be indifferent to us whether we fall victim to an overpowering neighbour or our own government [...] slavery (*niewola*) is always slavery' (p. 445, note 3). Polemicizing with Władysław Konopczyński, she shows that independence and liberty were not at odds with each other, but in republican theory they were complementary. The first depended on the second. The understanding of independence and liberty was common to the opponents and supporters of the Constitution of 3 May, but they located the greatest threat to liberty in different places. The author admits that this principle became less prominent in the second half of the seventeenth and the first half of the eighteenth century. The awareness that the freedom of the Commonwealth was threatened from abroad, although it appeared in 1733, when the election of Stanisław Leszczyński was overturned as a result of Russian intervention, became almost universal only during and after the confederacy of Bar (1768–72) and the first partition. After 1772 attention was often drawn to compatriots groaning under the yoke of the neighbouring

[18] Wojciech Szczygielski, *Referendum trzeciomajowe. Sejmiki lutowe 1792 roku*, Łódź, 1994, passim.

absolute monarchies. Grześkowiak-Krwawicz nonetheless soberly reflects that in 1775 and 1776 'the supposed despotism of the Permanent Council aroused significantly more fear and indignation than the fact that it had been imposed by a foreign power'. This attitude changed somewhat during the early phases of the Four Years Sejm (pp. 240–41).

Pages 242–44 contain probably the severest accusations made by the author, addressed to 'those participants in political discussions', who seemed not to discern any external threat. This illusory bliss, she believes, derived from the creation in their discourse of 'a kind of imaginary world [...] in which royal despotism was still the greatest threat to freedom' and changes to old laws paved the way to such despotism. When the external threat remained, it seems, beyond the horizon of Seweryn Rzewuski and his ilk, the advocates of reform spoke of it ever more drastically in order to justify change — their *leitmotiv* was the 'chasm' into which the nation was poised to fall. I would add here that this reformist discourse was strongly marked by the theme of Divine Providence.

'To live in a free country, or man and liberty' is the fifth part of *Regina libertas*. It is divided into two chapters, 'In the service of liberty' and 'The blessing of liberty'. Without losing sight either of the heritage of Antiquity or of early modern European thought, Grześkowiak-Krwawicz excavates the model of a free man and citizen, as described by early modern Polish authors from the sixteenth to the end of the eighteenth century. The demands were high: bravery in the defence of the Fatherland, zeal in public service, prudence in counsel (here lay the most important sense of the 'free voice'), and above all the voluntary, selfless and sacrificial submission of the individual good to the common good. This was the essential basis of *amor patriae* (I would add that in the second half of the eighteenth century we encounter the word *patriotyzm* ever more frequently). Almost everyone agreed that the continued existence and felicity of the free Commonwealth depended on the virtue of its free citizens. But the laments that care for the public good that had become empty words were beyond counting. A specifically Polish contribution to this litany, which was fairly typical for early modern Europe, was the conviction that Poles, to an exceptional degree, loved freedom. *Amor patriae*, we might say, overlapped with *amor libertatis*.

How could a man be made worthy of liberty? This classical dilemma was revived in the early modern period, leading some thinkers, such as Niccolò Machiavelli and Rousseau, and in Poland Staszic, to postulate the drastic restriction of individual freedom in the name of collective liberty. The author conducts a concise review of Polish views on the formation of a free man, first emphasizing the role of religion, and then that of 'national education'. Perhaps rather more could have been said about the role of religion in fortifying civic values, but this would have required the use of different kinds of sources.[19] Towards the end of the Commonwealth's existence disputes ignited over whether 'enlightenment' was

[19] Cf. Piotr Badyna, *Model człowieka w polskim piśmiennictwie parenetycznym XVIII w. (do 1773 r.)*, Warsaw, 2004, pp. 113–27.

necessary for the citizen, as such writers as Andrzej Zamoyski, Wybicki and Kołłątaj maintained, or whether it was better to trust in an 'unenlightened' but virtuous heart, as Seweryn and Adam Wawrzyniec Rzewuski claimed. The question of the link between 'enlightenment' and liberty also appeared in calls for the gradual 'enlightening' of the peasants, so that they might be admitted to personal 'freedom'. Grześkowiak-Krwawicz concludes the chapter by underlining the turning point affected by Konarski, who upturned the usual dependency between a free state and virtue: only the 'repair' of corrupted institutions and laws could raise up the fallen virtue of Poles.

This conceptual reversal leads to the discussion of the blessings ascribed to liberty. Only a free person was capable of virtue. This was no Polish particularity, shows the author, but a common strand in European thought, reaching back to Antiquity. A Polish perspective is however given by the comments of Polish travellers and writers on the qualities of those unhappy nations deprived of their freedom, and of the happy ones who still enjoyed liberty. A certain change took place towards the end of the eighteenth century, when some authors began to write of the natural desire for freedom felt by all humans. In this case as well, Grześkowiak-Krwawicz sees a synthesis between the heritage of early modern Polish thinking about freedom and the currents of the Enlightenment.

The sixth part of the book, without separate chapters, brings us the author's perspective on 'Myths and dilemmas of liberty'. It shows how nobles imagined Poland's place among free nations. Grześkowiak-Krwawicz devotes considerable space to the motif of fear in early modern Polish writing on freedom. While retaining the character of a researcher of political thought, she trespasses somewhat into the territory of discourse theorists, especially when she writes of the epithets of liberty: 'the fragile gift', 'the priceless treasure' etc. She encounters most difficulty with the connection between 'faith and liberty'. The elaborate theory of providential liberty expounded by Reverend Szymon Majchrowicz, often mentioned in this context by historians, was quite exceptional. A previous reviewer of *Regina libertas* has already written at length on this point, so I simply refer the reader to his arguments and evidence for the 'presupposed background' of political writing in the Commonwealth.[20] Perhaps a different selection of sources, such as sermons preached before the sejm, would have led Grześkowiak-Krwawicz to different conclusions. An important addition to the picture presented in this part of the book can be found in an article by Benedict Wagner-Rundell. At the beginning of the eighteenth century confessional hostility prevented Catholic Poles and Protestant Britons from recognizing each other as free nations. The two narratives of islands of liberty, exceptionally favoured by Providence, were so close to each other, that they were mutually exclusive. As he argues, 'it was the very point of comparison between the republican ideas of Britain and Poland-Lithuania that made contact between them so difficult'.[21]

[20] Parkitny's review (see note 6 above), pp. 265–66.

[21] Benedict Wagner-Rundell, 'Liberty, Virtue and the Chosen People: British and

The reader might well ask why, instead of a conclusion containing a summary of the author's theses, the last part of the book is a (previously published) piece titled '*Gustavus obiit...* The idea of liberty in the Kościuszko Rising'. It transpires, however, that this text plays the part of conclusion extremely well. Firstly, a separate summary is unnecessary, because the theses of the book are clearly stated at the beginning, and recalled in almost every succeeding chapter. Second, as Grześkowiak-Krwawicz explains, 'the question of the understanding and functioning of the concept of liberty in the Kościuszko Rising, although it chronologically falls within the eighteenth century, is undoubtedly a distinct problem, if only because, in this period of exceptional tension, which the insurrection certainly was, it is difficult to speak of some deeper political reflection' (p. 333). This question is also undoubtedly a most important problem in its own right. Theoretical reflections on the relation between liberty and independence have already been discussed. In 1794 it was time for the discourse of liberty and independence, linked to a discourse of 'fetters', 'chains' and 'the yoke', of 'violence' and 'slavery' to be applied to the armed struggle to restore a free Polish state — regarded as synonymous with a free Polish nation. For this reason, the sources for this part of the book differ from those of the preceding parts. Quotations are taken from decrees, proclamations, appeals and sermons, which were intended not so much to persuade readers and listeners to accept the views presented therein, but to inspire them to action. 'Most of all, however, it is essential to note that we are still dealing with the same tradition of thinking and speaking about freedom', argues the author on page 334. No new concepts of liberty were invented, although the social scope of freedom was widened considerably. Long-standing convictions of the qualities of free people were reflected in the contrasts drawn between 'knights of freedom' and 'bands of frightened slaves' (p. 345). This was not the time for discussion of civil and political liberty. The principal slogan of the insurrection linked 'liberty' and 'independence', but the boundary between the two concepts 'was quite fluid' (p. 337). The experience of the rising etched into Polish consciousness the old republican precept, that without an independent Fatherland there can be no liberty for its citizens.

The insurrection also directed anger towards those degenerate sons of the Fatherland who by their treasonable collaboration with foreign despots had led to the loss of liberty. The author notes that the fear of treason, which in France sanctioned ever more terrorist acts undertaken by the revolutionary government in the name of liberty, appeared in Poland in a far milder form than on the banks of the Seine. She does not engage with the question of the suspension of some rights and freedoms in order to establish a kind of insurrectionary dictatorship. It would be interesting to discover whether these steps were justified by references to the institution of the dictatorship in the

---

Polish Republicanism in the Early Eighteenth Century', in *Britain and Poland-Lithuania: Contact and Comparison from the Middle Ages to 1795*, ed. Richard Unger and Jakub Basista, Leiden and Boston, MA, 2008, pp. 197–214 (p. 214).

ancient Roman republic. Perhaps the sources contained no traces of this. But this problem would have linked itself to another matter raised by the author regarding the 'Jacobins': namely, that the preservation of national unity was of foremost importance. Such unity was praised and elevated above, for example, religious divisions. Grześkowiak-Krwawicz rightly emphasizes the significance of the slogan 'liberty or death', connecting it to the problem discussed earlier — of being worthy of freedom. God appears in this part of the book more often than elsewhere, perhaps as a result of the use of different sources. I would however somewhat more strongly than the author (pp. 345, 351) have accentuated the sacral tone in insurrectionary discourse.[22]

Grześkowiak-Krwawicz closes her book with an extremely important conclusion: In 1792–94 'it was apparent that liberty in the liberal understanding of the concept, individual freedom guaranteed only by law irrespective of who held power in the state, could not function in the conditions of the partitions. Reality expressly confirmed the old republican conviction that individual liberty is possible only in a free country, in which citizens influence the exercise of power' (p. 357). And so it proved, for most of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. I would add that in this experience lies the historical weakness of liberalism in Poland, which is still felt today. During liberalism's heyday in Western Europe, it did not have the conditions to flourish among Poles. The author stresses, however, that in the 1770s and 1780s writers shaped by the Enlightenment contributed new concepts, based on natural law, to the early modern Polish idea of liberty. This enabled the lasting widening of its social scope. And on this note the book finishes.

The other — let us call it proto-liberal — side of the thought of Wybicki, Pawlikowski, Ignacy Łobarzewski, Popławski, Bogusławski, Stroynowski and Skrzetuski left a weaker legacy. In the conditions of the insurrection nobody spoke of freedom as the 'tranquil enjoyment of property under the protection of the law' (p. 357). This reflection might be applied to the legacy of the Constitution of 3 May. Since the partitions, the Constitution continues to be more strongly present in Polish consciousness as a symbol of independence than as a solution to constitutional dilemmas. The content of the *Statute on Government* passed on 3 May 1791 was a kind of compromise between a renewed republicanism and limited monarchism. It might have led Poles, had it not been for the insurrection and the final partitions, towards the issues that preoccupied nineteenth-century liberalism.[23]

---

[22] Cf. Magdalena Ślusarska, 'Między sacrum a profanum. O obrzędowości powstania kościuszkowskiego', *Wiek Oświecenia*, 12, 1996, pp. 107–33.

[23] Cf. Emanuel Rostworowski, '"Marzenie dobrego obywatela", czyli królewski projekt Konstytucji', in idem, *Legendy i fakty XVIII wieku*, Warsaw, 1963, pp. 265–464; idem, 'Czasy saskie i oświecenie', in *Zarys Historii Polski*, ed. Janusz Tazbir, Warsaw, 1980, pp. 368–70; idem, *Maj 1791–Maj 1792. Rok monarchii konstytucyjnej*, Warsaw, 1985, p. 11; Richard Butterwick, 'Konstytucja 3 Maja na tle nowożytnej Europy. Synteza republikanizmu i monarchizmu', in *Lex est rex in Polonia et in Lithuania... Tradycje prawno-*

A dialogue can be conducted with the author at different levels, from the strictly historical to the fully contemporary. It seems to me that 'excavation', the favourite metaphor in the methodology proposed by Quentin Skinner, also characterizes the work of Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz. Skinner has sought to excavate the republican (or 'neo-Roman') theory of liberty by research on its sources and meanings in early modern Italy and England. Having excavated republican freedom, he presents it to the public at the beginning of the twenty-first century as an alternative to the liberal concept of freedom. He leaves the choice to his readers and listeners, but makes his own preference fairly clear.[24] It is similar, I believe, with the book under review. The early modern Polish, republican idea of liberty is presented to us anew, free from the dirt and dust which has covered it during the intervening centuries. The Enlightenment advocates of 'orderly freedom' probably did most damage to its image, in characterizing several generations of the Polish past as a time of 'aristocratic anarchy'.[25] Such judgments were perpetuated (and taken out of context) after the shock of the partitions, during further struggles for liberty and independence in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In *Regina libertas* we find both an argument against such stereotypes and a dialogue with the liberal idea of freedom. Grześkowiak-Krwawicz tries to keep with the bounds of chronology. She only slips up once, writing that Wybicki 'following the model of the liberals identified [civil liberty] with the freedom to act within the boundaries set by law' (p. 42). Wybicki rather drew on the same sources as those used by later liberals, above all Montesquieu and Locke. In the dialogue conducted by the author, proto-liberal elements are harmoniously written into the republican tradition.

It remains the case that the liberal idea of freedom has significantly weaker roots in Poland than in Great Britain or Italy, or even in contemporary France. The method of 'excavation' should also be applied to those, who in other circumstances could have become the progenitors of a Polish (or Polish-Lithuanian) liberal tradition. Apart from the authors listed above, and various other writers, preachers and orators, I would argue for the 'excavation' and recognition of the crucial contribution made to the ideology of limited monarchism by King Stanisław August.[26]

-ustrojowe Rzeczypospolitej — doświadczenie i dziedzictwo, ed. Adam Jankiewicz, 2nd edn, Warsaw, 2011, pp. 157–75.

[24] Skinner, *Liberty before Liberalism*, especially chapter 3.

[25] Cf. Butterwick, 'Political Discourses', passim.

[26] Emanuel Rostworowski, *Ostatni król Rzeczypospolitej. Geneza i upadek Konstytucji 3 maja*, Warsaw, 1966, passim; Richard Butterwick, 'The Enlightened Monarchy of Stanisław August Poniatowski (1764–1795)', in *The Polish-Lithuanian Monarchy in European Context*, pp. 192–217; idem, 'Positive and Negative Liberty in Eighteenth-Century Poland', in *Liberté: Héritage du Passé ou Idée des Lumières? / Freedom: Heritage of the Past or an Idea of the Enlightenment?*, ed. Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz and Izabella Zatorska, Kraków and Warsaw, 1993, pp. 60–69.

Unfortunately Grześkowiak-Krwawicz treats the views of the king as obviously self-interested, and does not consider them on their own merits (pp. 122, 140–41). His prominent, albeit anonymously published pamphlet *Suum cuique* (circa 1771), which undoubtedly belongs to the category of political thought, is twice quoted, but without the name of its author (pp. 226, 258, notes on pp. 444, 456). This is a significant omission. It appears that the last king of the Commonwealth has been excluded from the precept which is rightly applied to other writers: even if the author wrote from a self-interested position, his work should still be studied carefully, in order to discover the values of the society to which it was addressed. That might invite the reply that limited monarchists were a small minority among those who created eighteenth-century Polish political thought. However, their influence on the legislation of the second half of the Four Years Sejm was enormous. As Grześkowiak-Krwawicz demonstrates with regard to Wybicki and others, these authors contributed significantly to the shaping of republican thought. Stanisław August, brought up within and intimately acquainted with Polish republican culture, also exercised an influence on the Polish idea of liberty. The zenith of his influence came during the *annus mirabilis* of 1791–92, before it was consigned to oblivion as a result of the transformations described in the seventh part of the book.

Regina libertas is distinguished by its coherence and clarity. We might however wonder whether historical reality, even in the sphere of the theory of liberty, was as coherent as it appears in the pages of this book. The picture would have been complicated had more attention been given to the arguments of 'throne and altar'. However, reviewers should emphasize what a book contains, rather than what it leaves out. I could not find any factual errors. One might possibly complain that the author, in providing bibliographical details of books published beyond Poland, sometimes gives the publishing house, rather than the place of publication (publishers rarely give their addresses prominently). Nor are there many faults on the technical side of the book. The absence of a separate bibliography should be lamented, as it would have greatly assisted other researchers and students, especially those writing Master's theses. This function is only partially fulfilled by the extensive notes, which occupy 142 pages at the end of the book. Personally I prefer them placed at the bottom of each page, in order to facilitate reading. This is not difficult to achieve with today's publishing techniques. It should be recognized, however, that the book is attractively and carefully produced. It has an index of persons, and benefits from wide margins and an easily legible font, employed in an only slightly smaller format in the endnotes. Its handy size means that it is suited to reading on a train or an aeroplane. These qualities are far from universal today.

To conclude, Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz has given us an illustrious and hitherto unique book. *Regina libertas* greatly deepens our understanding of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, its values and its heritage. It enables us to rethink the phenomenon of the Enlightenment in Poland through the appreciation of elements of continuity, and not only turning points in political thought.

It is at the same time an invitation to dialogue at various levels. For this reason it should be required reading not only for academics and students of various disciplines, but also lawmakers and other people engaged in public activity. Last but not least, it writes Polish-Lithuanian thought on liberty into European history. It shows both foreign influences and original Polish contributions. For this reason this magnificent book should be translated into foreign languages as soon as possible.[27]

Summary

Regina Libertas (Gdańsk, 2006) is the magnificent culmination of Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz's work on Polish political thought in the eighteenth century. It is based on a profound knowledge and understanding of treatises, pamphlets and other political texts reaching back to the sixteenth century. It steers a careful course between an abstract history of ideas and research on political culture, which would involve an unmanageable amount of research on mostly unpublished sources. The author situates the Polish idea of freedom squarely within the early modern republican, or 'neo-Roman' tradition explored by intellectual historians such as Quentin Skinner and John G. A. Pocock. According to this theory, the 'negative' liberty of the individual citizens from coercion (the essence of the liberal idea of freedom) depends on their 'positive' liberty to participate in the political process. In the Polish-Lithuanian case this entailed a panoply of restrictions on the monarch. Grześkowiak-Krwawicz presents Polish thought on liberty in six thematic parts covering: 'Old and new freedom'; 'Whence came liberty?'; 'Pillars of freedom'; 'Liberty in peril'; 'Liberty and independence'; 'Man and liberty'; and 'Myths and dilemmas of liberty'. They are followed by a final part on the revitalized idea of freedom during the Kościuszko Rising of 1794. *Regina Libertas* is written in an engaging manner that encourages dialogue at many levels. The author of this review article takes up that invitation, drawing attention to the contributions of thinkers and statesmen, including King Stanisław August Poniatowski, whose writings and speeches pointed towards a (proto-)liberal, rather than a republican idea of freedom. These thinkers remained in a minority compared to decided republicans, but they exercised significant influence on reforms enacted in Stanisław August's reign, especially the Constitution of 3 May 1791.

[27] A shortened (135 pp.) English edition was published by Brill (Leiden and Boston, MA) in 2012 under the title *Queen Liberty: The Concept of Freedom in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth*.

Kwartalnik Historyczny
Vol. CXXI, 2014,
Special Issue
PL ISSN 0023-5903

Aneta Pieniądz, *Tradycja i władza. Królestwo Włoch pod panowaniem Karolingów, 774–875*, Wrocław 2007, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, pp. 503, Monografie Fundacji na Rzecz Nauki Polskiej

Aneta Pieniądz studied history under Karol Modzelewski. She is already known among Polish students of the Middle Ages as the author of several valuable articles. All of them concern, as does her monograph, (which is a modified version — but we do not know to what extent — of her doctoral dissertation defended at the University of Warsaw in 2004) the social and political history of Italy in the early Middle Ages. While her earlier texts (but not all of them) were concerned mainly with the reign of the Lombard rulers (568–774), the monograph under review deals with the next century — one in which Lombard Italy came under the rule of the Frankish Empire, without, however, losing its autonomy. If the history of an independent kingdom of Lombardy has attracted limited interest among Polish historians — to put it mildly — then the period of Carolingian rule in Italy remains completely unexplored. This, in some measure, as Pieniądz remarks in the preface to her book, also needs to be put down to Italian historiography's long reluctance to take a more genuine interest in this, considered as a colourless — and rather unrelated both to earlier Roman greatness and to later communal achievements — period of the history of the Italian Peninsula. At the same time, it needs to be stressed that Pieniądz quite often, but always in a way relevant to the main argument, ranges far back into the earlier era — that of an independent kingdom. The period that follows Carolingian rule in Italy is also touched on in the book — although in a lesser (but not less significant) degree.

As far as Polish historiography is concerned, Pieniądz ventures into unexplored and virgin territory.[1] Only gradually is this territory drawing the attention of historians from other countries (Italy in the first place) finally able to examine it in a way unencumbered by extra-scholarly factors. Pieniądz presents the Polish reader with an almost unknown page in the history of the Middle Ages and the way she does it — apart from embodying the tradition of excellent scholarship — shows her outstanding scholarly talent, accompanied by a great erudition and scholarly acribia.

[1] The work by Jakub Kujawiński, 'Strategie budowania tożsamości zbiorowych wśród Longobardów z Italii Południowej (VIII–XI w.)', *Scripta Minora*, 4, 2006, pp. 7–198, published at about the same time as the publication reviewed here indicates a change occurring in this regard.

The structure of the work is simple and clear, logically proceeding from the conception set out with sufficient clarity in the preface. Leaving the 'preface' (pp. 7–37) — including the discussion of primary sources — and concise conclusions (pp. 445–48) aside, the work is divided into three chapters. The discussion of primary sources mentioned above leaves one with no doubt that Pieniądz is a competent scholar. It also reveals a great abundance (albeit 'afflicted' with some disproportions) of the early medieval sources to be found in Italy (especially in comparison with the situation in Poland), and — consequently and quite unexpectedly — a huge amount of work still waiting to be done by historians, especially in Italy in collecting and publishing these materials. Chapters 1–3, offering a detailed analysis, form the essential part of the work. They are devoted to three aspects of the history of the post-Lombard Italy in the ninth century. The first deals with 'political and ideological foundations of Carolingian rule in Italy'. Pieniądz begins with the account of the final years of an independent kingdom and then turns to discuss the reign of successive Carolingian rulers — Charles the Great, Pépin Carloman, Bernard, Lothar and Louis II. In the second chapter, Carolingian rule over the Italian Peninsula is approached from the angle of the history of the administration of the country. Pieniądz is particularly interested in the origin and evolution of a typically Lombard institution of the *gastaldi*. However, lower offices, on which the evidence is not so abundant, also are not left out of her account. While the focus in the first two chapters is on the analysis of political and administrative aspects of the history of ninth-century Italy, in the third one it shifts on an important social issue. Most strictly linked to the major theme of the whole monograph, the issue concerns 'a bond of personal dependence' in Lombard and Carolingian Italy. The work closes with 'conclusions', a list of abbreviations, an extensive bibliography divided into primary sources and secondary literature, English summary, and index.

The work's most important finding — probably not only in my opinion — lies in demonstrating that after the fall of an independent kingdom, its political, legal and social structures continued to exist to a much greater degree than has so far been assumed. Repeatedly emphasized by Pieniądz, this central thesis appears to be well-documented. Both Charles the Great and his Italian successors were concerned about cementing their legitimacy as rulers and realized that in the pursuit of this goal Lombard traditions had to be reckoned with (inasmuch, of course, as the cultivation of these traditions entailed no threat to their power). This applied both to some symbolic actions which, especially in the case of the conquered people, bore some significance (the crowning of a new ruler with the crown of Lombard kings, the maintaining of Pavia's status as capital of the country or the sustaining of the belief, at least for some time, that the union was only personal) as well as to a variety of other decisions made by Carolingian rulers. The conduct of such a cautious policy was not futile. A considerable part of the political elite of the conquered kingdom was won over for new rule and managed to adapt themselves to the new circumstances. However, concealed by the appearance of autonomy was a tough reality. Following the reign of Charles the Great, Italian rulers

were fully dependent on the supreme king. Against this background Pieniądz analyses later crises and struggles through the prism of the political ambitions of Italian rulers and Italian elites who, in trying to fulfill those ambitions — with varying (but always limited) success — sometimes decided to draw on the tradition of the Lombard kingdom and sometimes turned away from it. Contrary to common belief, the Lombard administrative system proved vigorous and efficient and — undergoing some necessary modifications — was not only adopted but survived in some important aspects until the end of Carolingian rule. In fact, one needs — in line with the opinion expressed by Pieniądz — to speak about a mixed (Lombard-Frankish) system brought into being in Italy in the wake of its conquest by the Franks. The strength and attractiveness of some of its elements, along with the advantages it had for rulers, are attested to by a weak and rather late adoption of the Frankish institution of vassalage tied up with *beneficium*, despite royal authority's obvious interest in the transformation of the earlier kinds of loose bond with which it was connected to elites into a much stricter vassal relationship. Perhaps, as Pieniądz probably rightly suggests, the fact that the authority in Italy did not apply much pressure in trying to promote vassalage may have originated in a relative weakness of Italian aristocracy. Moreover, in Italy vassalage was not connected to the benefice system as strictly as elsewhere. Probably it is for this reason that in Carolingian Italy the power structures never went through the process of feudalization ('appropriation') so typical of the Frankish state. In political terms the Frankish conquest certainly marked a breakthrough, but 'it entailed neither deep institutional changes nor any social turbulence, though undoubtedly contributing to the intensification of the processes that had been begun to unfold still in the Lombard times' (p. 445).

Aneta Pieniądz's work is a great scholarly achievement and a significant contribution to world historiography. As such it deserves to be published in a non-Polish version (seven-and-half pages summary in English can provide those who do not read Polish only with a general idea of the book's content). The work also needs to be praised for the clarity of its narrative — rich in content and splendid in form. In addition to evincing scholarly maturity, Pieniądz also shows much tact in formulating opinions different from those expressed by some of the leading authorities in the field. The work's documentation is exemplary — exhaustive but not overloaded. And given the method employed by the author and the way in which she develops her argument — the work, although it is addressed to historians, can also serve as a methodical model for students and young scholars.

Jerzy Strzelczyk
(Poznań)
(Translated by Artur Mękarski)

Gary Macy, *The Hidden History of Women's Ordination. Female Clergy in the Medieval West*, Oxford, 2008, Oxford University Press, pp. 260

One needs to start with a word of explanation. Contrary to what the title phrase 'the hidden history' — commonly found in a variety of sensationalist publications — may suggest, this review concerns a scholarly work containing critical apparatus and published by a prestigious academic publisher. The work's main focus is on the question of female ordination in the early Middle Ages and on the process that led to the exclusion of women from the ordained ministry. However, one must say that it concerns itself to the same degree with different ways of understanding the term 'ordination' before and after the Gregorian reform.

The work deals with a problem in the history of the Church that strongly resonates with present-day theological debates. Fully aware of this fact, Gary Macy tries to keep historical and theological aspects of the problem apart. His aim, he says, is to answer the question of what it was like and not what it should be like now. He declares that he is not going to turn to the past for arguments to be used in the current discussion concerning the ordination of women.

However, the approach he declares often differs from the one he actually takes; it is not always possible to say that he succeeds in developing his argument *sine ira et studio*. Obviously, the eagerness with which he tries to prove that women were ordained to hold various ecclesiastical positions weighs heavily upon the whole work and leads Macy to offer interpretations that leave much to be desired. For example, he tries to show that women were allowed to participate in the performance of episcopal service. However, in referring to women bestowed with the title '*episcopa*', he offers examples which concern either the bishop's wife or the bishop's widow, or — as in two cases — relate to unclear situations. It is hard to consider, as does Macy (p. 54), the scenes from the Celtic Life of St Bridget to be evidence of the elevation of women to the position of bishop. The Life of St Bridget depicts the ordination of the Irish saint by a bishop who, acting under divine influence, temporarily lost his own mental faculties. The hagiographer undoubtedly aimed to show an unusual situation: the extraordinary grace which God bestowed on St Bridget, along with His omnipotence clearly seen in the appointment of a female bishop. Whether such misinterpretations result from the assumptions underlying the work of a historian trying to prove his thesis, or that of a theologian searching for arguments in support of the adoption of a specific solution by the contemporary Church, is of secondary significance.

The book is divided into five chapters, the last of which offers detailed conclusions. It also contains two useful appendices, bringing together a variety of liturgical texts concerning the ordination of deaconesses and abbesses which have hitherto remained scattered. The first chapter provides a panoramic view of the present state of the discussion, including both its theological and historical aspects. This valuable account of the history of the controversy, covering the period from the first Bollandists to the present day, and taking into consid-

eration the most recent publications, devotes much space to the problem central to Macy's work, that is, the understanding of the term 'ordination'.

This problem is dealt with in the second chapter. Drawing on existing scholarship, Macy shows the way in which the term was understood in the early history of the Church differs from the way in which it came to be understood from the eleventh century onwards. He argues that in early medieval Christianity ordination was staged to celebrate designation to a particular post in the Church, including those unconnected with altar service. It is characteristic that such concepts as *ordinare*, *consacrare* and *benedicere* were often used interchangeably. In this sense consecrated widows or virgins were also regarded — just like acolytes, ostiaries, exorcists, abbots or kings — as having been ordained.

However, in the eleventh century there began to crystalize a new understanding of *ordinatio* which can be considered to have acquired the meaning of 'ordination', for it referred to the power vested in the priesthood and implied the ability to perform transubstantiation. Those who promoted this new understanding of the term were becoming increasingly aware of the fact that ordination proper applied to only three higher orders of the priesthood: deacon, presbyters s and bishops. Everything else could be regarded as a blessing, the imposition of hands, but not as an ordination. Even a deacon could actually be considered ordained only in so far as his *ordo* was a step towards the priesthood proper and towards the performance of the priest's service.

Where does this stand relative to the female question? The eleventh and twelfth centuries, along with a shift in the meaning of ordination, gave rise to the belief that women not only could not be ordained but were also incapable of accepting ordination, while in the pre-Gregorian Church, says Macy, women actually were ordained, although ordination had a different meaning. This view appears to be correct and the analysis demonstrating that ordination was understood differently before and after the Gregorian reform needs to be recognized as the best part of the whole book. However, some serious doubts have to be raised. In dealing with the earlier period, Macy tries to prove that such concepts as *ordinatio* or *bendictio* were used interchangeably and here his line of argument is quite convincing. But there is a tendency to be discerned in the examples he offers. Where reference is made to a priest, lector, abbot, or abbess, there usually appears the word *ordinatio*. Where a virgin or widow is concerned, the word used is rather *benedictio* or *consecratio*. This tendency is in itself significant and it remains unnoticed in Macy's discussion of various *ordines*.

This part of the work also seems to suffer from a serious shortcoming: it leaves completely untouched the question of anointing. True, anointing came to be part of the rite of consecration in the eighth century, which is relatively late. However, it needs to be regarded as quite significant that in the period that was still so far removed from the era of the Gregorian reform, unction was the honour reserved only for (setting rulers aside) presbyters and bishops, thus excluding deacons and other lower *ordines*, let alone widows or virgins

(some sources of English provenance which mention the anointing of deacons are an exception). What is more, the anointing of the hands of newly ordained priests was unequivocally combined with the power to confect the Eucharist. This is important to the extent that it allows us to understand the hierarchy of ordination in the early Middle Ages, and in some measure it also seems to call into question the interpretation put forward by Macy. The fact that the ordination ceremony performed with chrism began to be distinguished from that performed without it appears to indicate that the act of ordaining a priest or a bishop was considered to be essentially different from all the other forms of the ordination ritual. This is of course significant in the context of the main topic of the work. For the first kind of ordination, that applying to bishops and priests, seems to have remained — there is no evidence to suggest otherwise — inaccessible to women.

Another chapter deals with specific positions occupied by women in the pre-Gregorian Catholic Church. Macy discusses the offices of *episcopa*, *presbytera*, deaconess and — somewhat separately — abbess. As far as the first two are concerned, he succeeds in providing evidence for the existence of these titles in the early medieval Church. With regard to *episcopa*, all evidence suggests, as has already been mentioned, that it simply denoted a bishop's wife. Macy also fails to provide convincing evidence that the title of *presbytera* was conferred on women who performed some priestly service. The title was used in reference to priests' wives or some distinguished widows, perhaps widows of priests. Sometimes it happened that they were — just like deaconesses (understood here as deacons' wives) — ordained on the same day as their husbands and were in some way involved in the performance of altar service, which sparked violent protests from some Church councils. Undoubtedly, the material gathered by Macy is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the role of the wives of priests and deacons in the Catholic Church, including their liturgical service. However, the evidence that survives is too scarce and flimsy to claim that until the end of the eleven century 'Some women did minister at the altar as priests' (p. 65).

Things look different with deaconesses and abbesses, since there is ample evidence of the performance of these functions by women. The arguments offered in support of the view that the title deaconess was not limited only to a deacon's wife are much stronger than those offered with regard to *presbytera*. Above all, we have strong evidence in the form of separate *ordines*, although those for a deaconess resemble at many points the *ordo* for virgins rather than deacons. There are reasons to believe that deaconesses and abbesses exercised liturgical functions, although the range of those functions remains open to debate.

The problem is that Macy, while focusing his attention on the ordination of women, leaves basically untouched the issue of their status as members of the clergy, in spite of the fact that, as the subtitle clearly suggests, this is supposed to be one of the work's main topics. He never explains the criteria that allow him to include women of the pre-Gregorian era among the members of the clergy. Moreover, such an inclusion is far from obvious as he himself —

quite paradoxically — proves. In the second chapter, he makes a great effort to show that the post-Gregorian division between the clergy and the laity can hardly be applied to the pre-Gregorian period. This view, in turn, implies that in dealing with this early phase in the history of the Church, one is required to precisely define the term 'clergy'. Macy offers no such definition. Consequently, it is hard to say what Macy means by 'female clergy'.

Similar doubts can be raised with regard to the fact that he confines himself only to a discussion of the ordination of abbesses and deaconesses. Why does he omit from his analysis the ordination of consecrated widows or virgins, if, as he claims, the belief that they need to be regarded as lay members of the Christian community was produced only by Gregorian reformers? As a result, in the selection of the material to be analysed in his work, Macy follows present or post-Gregorian criteria to denote a member of the clergy. And yet these are the very same criteria he clearly tries to distance himself from. Of course, he explains that his concern is exclusively with the positions which, although initially held also by women, became accessible only to men, as well as with the gradual exclusion of women (the problem dealt with in the fourth chapter) from these positions during the Gregorian reform. However, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the selection of the source material by Macy is not only inconsistent but also arbitrary.

It seems that he also exaggerates the scale of the change brought about by the Gregorian reform, thus demonizing it. For example, he writes about two visions of the Church. In his opinion the vision of the Church as a monastery was one that prevailed in the period of the Gregorian reform, while that striving for its legitimacy in the pre-Gregorian era promoted a model of the Church in which many Church functions were to be performed 'on a family level'. This last vision was supposed to appreciate marriage and the role it was supposed to play (p. 79). Although it is possible to offer a number of examples of such a 'family Church' in operation, with some Church functions passing from father to son, one is tempted to ask Macy about the theoretical foundations of such a vision. It should be said that it would be difficult to find theologians — including pre-Gregorian ones — who actually attached a great importance to marriage and especially claimed that priests' marriages should be regarded as having a very important role to play.

Gregorian ideas that penetrated Canon law, says Macy elsewhere, are to blame for creating an image of women as intellectually inferior to men, not much different from children and dependent on the help of others (p. 119). Undoubtedly, it was the revival of Aristotelian philosophy that had a hand in fostering such an image of women. However, it is open to debate whether this revival can be linked to the Gregorian reform movement. How can one explain the fact that only canonists of the post-Gregorian era considered a woman's consent to her marriage to be of crucial importance, in contrast to an earlier period when it was considered sufficient to obtain the consent of her family? Under German laws, for example, a women — just like a child — had to remain

all the time in someone's care. Contrary to the opinion expressed by Macy, the view of a women's intellectual dependence was not born in the Gregorian era. Not only was it deeply rooted in German tradition but it can also be found in the thought of the Church Fathers and other Christian writers long before the Gregorian period.

As the remarks made above clearly indicate, Gary Macy's work arouses mixed feelings. Certainly, it is a valuable introduction to the problem of understanding the term ordination in the early medieval Church and of the changes brought about by the Gregorian reform. It also raises an important, if little known, question concerning the functions performed by women in the Church in the early Middle Ages, bringing together scattered and sometimes vague sources. Nonetheless, the view that women were ordained not only in a pre-Gregorian but also in a post-Gregorian sense of ordination — performing priestly services as full members of the clergy — hangs heavily on the whole work. The inadequate application of the post-Gregorian understanding of ordination to the pre-Gregorian period and the acceptance of a strong thesis — apparently connected with Macy's own worldview — deeply affects the interpretation of the sources and appears to be the work's greatest weakness.

Grzegorz Pac
(Poznań–Warsaw)
(Translated by Artur Mękarski)

Walter Leitsch, *Das Leben am Hof König Sigismunds III. von Polen*, 4 vols, Vienna and Kraków, 2009, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Polnische Akademie der Wissenschaften und Künste, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, pp. 2861

Walter Leitsch lived just long enough to see the publication of his monumental study on the court of King Sigismund III (r. 1587–1632). The Austrian scholar spent many years, beginning in 1970, working in European archives and libraries gathering material to illustrate the culture and workings of Sigismund's court. As a result Leitsch has produced a work which can be viewed as his *opus magnum*. It explores all the important aspects of court life during the reign of Poland's first Vasa king. The work has an interdisciplinary character, and Leitsch appears to be as competent in discussing political history as he is in dealing with the problems of the history of art, or of material culture.

The book is divided into ten parts, each of which touches on a different problem closely connected with Sigismund III's court. The first part raises the question of the material basis on which the court depended. Here the author aims to survey the King's income, as well as the financial positions of his two wives and other members of the royal family. In addressing this issue, he fo-

cuses his attention specifically on the years 1622–29, since it is with regard to this period that historical evidence is particularly abundant.

The second part deals with the people who made up the court, with the arrangement of particular chapters reflecting the position they occupied in the court hierarchy. As such, the author begins his analysis with ministers and high ranking dignitaries — both Crown and Lithuanian — and completes it with the kitchen boys and grooms. In addition, he includes the King's secretaries and the courts of both Queens.

The third part presents the person of King Sigismund III. Its chapters show the monarch as a politician, his relations with the nobles, foreign policy, nominations to public office, the distribution of crown estates (*królewszczyzny*) among the realm's subjects, and questions of religious toleration. The author also deals with the King's relationship with his family, his lifestyle and religiosity, and his attitudes to art and learning, his illnesses and death.

The next part depicts the royal family. Separate chapters present the King's sister Anna, his two Habsburg wives, Anna and Constance, the children Sigismund had by both of his wives, and his mother-in-law Mary, Archduchess of Styria. However, he omits Sigismund's aunt Anna Jagiellon, the Queen of Poland and the widow of King Stephen Báthory. Leitsch presents interesting details concerning the life of Anna, the king's sister, including plans for her marriage. The chapter dealing with the Archduchess Mary also offers some new information. However, in general there is little new to be found in those parts of the work devoted to the King's children. I shall have more to say about the fifth part of the book later. The sixth part deals with the food and drink served at Sigismund III's court.

The next part concerns the artistic and material cultures of the court. The author discusses the wardrobes of the King and Queens and the royal beds and bed linen, and depicts the interiors of the royal castle. There is also information about objects kept outside the royal residence. His interest here lies in means of transportation such as coaches, wagons, sedan chairs, sledges, boats, as well as in horse harnesses, pillows, sheets, chests, compasses, and animals — especially horses and livestock.

In the eighth part, Leitsch deals with the King's jewellery and his art collections. The author devotes his attention to the royal collection of paintings, dividing them according to different categories such as portraits or religious paintings, while elsewhere he comments on sculptures such as figures of the Virgin Mary, the apostles, and other saints (Stanislaus, Casimir, Sigismund). Among the royal tapestries, he singles out the series showing the 'Story of Scipio'. Reliquaries are treated separately.

The penultimate part considers the life of the court while travelling around the Commonwealth. The author's focus here is on the King's journeys from Kraków to Warsaw, for parliamentary sessions, the ruler's departure from Warsaw to Danzig in 1593, and his return to Kraków from Danzig the following year. Sigismund's journey to Wielkopolska (Great Poland) and Royal Prussia in 1623 is

dealt with here. In highlighting these issues, the author pays special attention to the condition of roads and lodgings and is particularly drawn to the problem of the itinerant court's supply system.

In the last part of the book Leitsch addresses the problem of court life during incidences of the plague. Niepołomice, Osieck, Ujazdów and Tykocin were among the Sigismund's favourite places of refuge.

The work contains several interesting annexes. They include, among other things, the composition of the court personnel and the salaries of Sigismund's courtiers from 1589, the list of those who remained in the service of Queen Anna and their salaries from 1595, the inventory of the Queen's garments from 1592, a comparison of the royal kitchen's expenditure in the two weeks before the King's marriage to Archduchess Anna in 1592 and one week after the wedding, and the inventory of Sigismund's garments from 1595. Also included is a list of abbreviations, an extensive bibliography, which unfortunately does not separate primary sources from secondary literature, and indexes of names, bodily parts, animals and plants, places, countries, functions, titles, groups and phenomena.

It would be impossible to offer a comprehensive review of such a large work. A choice has to be made concerning the problems to be addressed more closely. The most interesting aspect for a historian of political culture is the analysis in the fifth part, entitled 'Die Vertrauten'. This section runs to almost 300 pages and in itself could constitute a full-length monograph. It is characteristic, that by consistently using the term 'confidant', Leitsch creates a social category which is much wider than just Sigismund's favourites. It involves — in addition to the most powerful men of the realm — those who, in enjoying the ruler's confidence, were only used as instruments to facilitate the carrying out of confidential missions. The group is, therefore, made up of both high ranking dignitaries as well as men of more humble origin — representatives of the petty nobility or even plebeians.

The author is fully aware of the existence of different degrees of royal trust. Hence, he specifies those who were on such close to the ruler that they were admitted into the domestic life of the royal family and were on almost friendly terms with monarch. This group is referred to as the inner circle. At first, it included the King's sister Anna, then Sigismund's first wife, and, temporarily, the Jesuit Sigismund Ernhofer. It was also at this time that Georg Schiechel became one of his most trusted men. Later, the inner circle was expanded to include Ursula Meyerin and Casper Denhoff. The author's attention is concentrated especially on the last three of these people.

Georg Schiechel, a plebeian from Bavaria, arrived at the royal court in 1592 as a chamberlain of Anna of Austria. Undoubtedly, he was dependent on Archduchess Maria, the King's mother-in-law. The analysis of a great number of letters sent by Schiechel to the Archduchess, in which he talked about the position to which he had risen, convinced Leitsch that Schiechel had an exceptional role at court and was extremely close to the ruler. To this the author adds other argu-

ments. He indicates that Schiechel was paid more than the two other chamberlains, was entrusted with the task of encrypting the Queen's letters to her mother, and was responsible for checking the inventory of the royal jewellery. On several occasions Sigismund dispatched Schiechel to Graz to inform the Archduchess Mary of events in Poland. It seems, therefore, that he enjoyed the confidence of both Sigismund and his first wife, but the author exaggerates in placing him in the circle of the King's most trusted advisors. Indeed, Leitsch himself raises doubts. He asks how someone who, for all his intelligence and loyalty, could become the King's advisor, since he had displayed no deeper intellectual qualities. Despite these doubts, Leitsch argues that Schiechel advised Sigismund in matters concerning Danzig and Brandenburg. This opinion is based on an account by the city's envoy, Keckerbart, who on 8 June 1598 supposedly informed the Danzig authorities that the king had conversed for half an hour with Schiechel concerning their city (p. 1846). It was probably not Sigismund himself but Schiechel who told Keckerbart about the conversation. Moreover, it is highly likely that Schiechel — who acted as an intermediary in order to secure Keckerbart his audience with the King — exaggerated his own role in order to obtain payment for his services. It seems likely that the envoy of the largest city of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth would have been received by the King without such mediation. A similar situation took place three years later when the Brandenburg envoys sought an audience with the King. Should one really assume that they would not have been granted the audience without Schiechel's help? In my opinion there is insufficient evidence to suggest that Schiechel was one of the King's confidants. In March 1595 Sigismund ennobled him. This was a great reward for his service, but is this really proof for his special relations with the monarch? At the beginning of 1601, when the King was having a meal with his sister Anna, Schiechel served at the table. This is equally weak evidence for placing him within the king's inner circle.

A substantial study of seventy-four pages is devoted to Ursula Meyerin. There is no doubt that she merits our attention. The author convincingly explains that her real name was Meyerin and that she should not be confused with another Ursula who bore the name Gienger (Gengerin) and who also served at Queen Anna's court (pp. 1849–51). Leitsch rejects the opinion that it was Ursula who sexually initiated the young Prince Władysław. Leitsch is just as trenchant and convincing when discarding the view that she was a spy whom the Habsburgs had managed to plant in Sigismund's court. Certainly, she served as a good intermediary between the Polish king and the Habsburgs. However, whenever there was a conflict of interests she remained loyal to the Polish ruler. She acquired considerable influence over the upbringing of the royal children, and under Queen Constance she became the most influential among the queen's ladies-in-waiting. She was also loyal and faithful to Prince Władysław, whom she had raised. She never wavered in her loyalty to him even when he was in conflict with his father. It is also worth noting that she had a good command of Polish and was also able to read Latin texts, although we know nothing of her education. Ursula was born in Munich,

probably in 1572, where her mother, Anna Meyerin, was employed at the court. The author mentions various theories about Ursula's descent. He takes a closer look at the suggestion that Prince William of Bavaria, known for having four illegitimate daughters, might have been her father. The line of argument concerning Ursula's ducal father presented by the author appears to be quite convincing. Credence is lent to this theory by the fact that young Meyerin appeared at Court in Graz as a foster child of Archduchess Mary, that is, William's sister. Meyerin owed the launch of her career at court to Queen Anna. However, it was not long before she became the Queen's trusted 'second hand'. Testimony to her genuine closeness to the Queen is the fact that the women sometimes took meals together. Meyerin also managed to develop a similar relationship with Queen Constance. The author provides some interesting information about the role which this relationship between Ursula, the King and the Queen played in foreign policy. According to Count Adam Schwarzenberg, who in 1620 served as the Brandenburg envoy, during his audience with the Queen, Ursula was standing next to her, but a little way behind her. Schwarzenberg complained that although the Queen was extremely gracious towards him, it was of no use in the face of Ursula's opposition to any concession in the Elector's favour (p. 1898). Leitsch has provided us with a striking interpretation of this scene. He judges that it was the King who ordered Ursula to prevent the queen from making any commitment which might prove harmful. The author engages in a polemic with Wanda Dobrowolska, rejecting the view that Ursula also participated in the audiences held by the King.

Sigismund's second wife, unlike his first, could not play a role in advising the King, for she was uninterested in politics and apparently was not as bright as her older sister. This would explain why it was Ursula who began to perform that role. Leitsch wonders why it took so long for Sigismund to avail himself of her counsel. He thinks that it may have had something to do with the problems caused by the King's twenty-year old son, Władysław. As the young prince was formally put in her care, she and the king had much to discuss. It was only then, Leitsch believes, that the King discovered her talents. However, this explanation is not fully satisfactory. In dealing with the issue, one needs to take into consideration the changes that took place in the royal court at this time. In July 1615 the Grand Marshal of the Crown, Zygmunt Myszkowski, died, to be followed to the grave in August by the Marshal of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Krzysztof Monwid Dorohostajski. Andrzej Bobola, Chamberlain of the Crown, passed away on 16 November 1616, and at the beginning of 1617 the Chancellor of the Crown, Szczęsny Kryski, also died. This succession of deaths left a void in the circle of the king's advisors, which the trusted and talented Hofmistress was perfectly suited to fill. The author is aware of the fact that it was as early as 1606 that Meyerin was attacked for meddling in politics, but he attaches little importance to it. However, one might wonder whether those nobles who supported the rebellion which Mikołaj Zebrzydowski, the Palatine of Kraków, led against the King were not wholly mistaken. If this was the case, then Ursula's

political significance evolved over time, and around 1615–16 she acquired permanent status as an important, albeit informal advisor to the king.

The author also raises the question of Ursula's influence on internal affairs. He says that she was asked for help on various occasions. There is much evidence to support this view. Leitsch agrees with Krzysztof Chłapowski and the author of this review that she was able to influence the ruler's decisions concerning distribution of royal land and of less significant offices, but that she was not able to play as essential a role in the appointments of leading dignitaries of the Kingdom (p. 1921).

The last person from the King's inner circle whose role is discussed in the book is Casper Denhoff. The author rejects the view held by Władysław Czapliński that Denhoff made his way into the court as early as 1600. The evidence confirms his presence at court seven years later (p. 1923). Denhoff was quick to win the King's confidence and was relied upon by the ruler as an intermediary who helped him to deal with matters relating to Prussia and Brandenburg. Leitsch stresses the fact that it was in 1616 that Jerzy Ossoliński referred to Denhoff as the monarch's favourite 'valet'. The author asks whether the King's confidant was also in the pay of the Brandenburg Elector. Denhoff's name is absent from the list of those who received financial remuneration from the Elector in 1614. However, he is known to have received 380 florins from the ruler of Brandenburg Prussia in 1618. Hence, it cannot be ruled out, says the author, that he derived some financial profit for his service. Nevertheless, according to Leitsch there is evidence to advocate the view that Sigismund remained closely associated with his favourite: 1) they used to sing Calvinist psalms together, 2) it was Denhoff who carried the enfeebled monarch over to his throne (from 1631), and 3) Denhoff was endowed with such a charming personality that he easily attracted others. The author also tries to answer the question of when the King's counsellor converted to Catholicism. He thinks that it must have taken place between 1618 and 1628 (pp. 1931–32). This, however, can be determined with more accuracy. There survives a letter from Rafał Leszczyński to Denhoff dated 10 January 1625 which clearly indicates that the conversion took place at the turn of 1624/25.[1] To conclude the remarks on the group of Sigismund's most trusted men, it is worth emphasising a point which seems to have escaped the author's attention. Both Denhoff and Meyerin's gradual rise to political eminence was parallel. They both began to build their position in 1616 and their ascendancy, once achieved, continued until the end of Sigismund's reign.

[1] This is how Denhoff's friend viewed his conversion to Catholicism: 'Beforehand, if somebody deigned to say something of this sort about me, it could be supposed that it resulted from Lutheran connections. Now, as a Catholic, say what you know of this, and it will mean more than it did previously, and I shall benefit from this thing, which I do not altogether praise', Rafał Leszczyński to Casper Denhoff, 10 January 1625, quoted after Edward Opaliński, *Elita władzy w województwach poznańskim i kaliskim za Zygmunta III*, Poznań, 1981, p. 64.

Among the other high ranking officials who surrounded the King the author mentions are: Marcin Leśniowolski, Albrycht Stanisław Radziwiłł, Stanisław and Marcin Krasicki, Mikołaj Wolski, Andrzej Bobola, Krzysztof Monwid Dorohostajski, Zygmunt Myszkowski, Łukasz Opaliński and Maksymilian Przerębski. The first of them, Marcin Leśniowolski, the Castellan of the Podlasie region could not, contrary to the view held by the author, come from a middling noble family as his father served as the Castellan of Warsaw and his uncle was the Castellan of Czersk. According to Leitsch, it was as early as 1590 that he lost Sigismund's confidence. This view is based upon the belief that the monarch refused to inform Leśniowolski of his plan to abdicate (p. 1939).[2] In trying to prove the King's unwillingness to reveal his plans to the Castellan, the author relies on the account by the papal nuncio, Annibale di Capua, of 30 October 1590. The nuncio reports that Leśniowolski informed him of the King's secret negotiations with Archdukes Ernst and Maximilian. But at that time, as the author rightly points out, Sigismund conducted no negotiations with Maximilian, from which it follows that Leśniowolski was no longer familiar with the details of Sigismund's policy (p. 1940). However, this all lends itself to a different interpretation. Leśniowolski, realizing how unpopular Maximilian was, and knowing that the nuncio was his adherent, deliberately attempted to misinform the latter. He must have expected di Capua to divulge this information to Maximilian's Polish followers. Public knowledge of Sigismund's negotiations with Maximilian would have been more damaging to the ruler's reputation than if only his talks with Ernst had been leaked. Leśniowolski, as the papal nuncio reported, left the court in disgrace on 1 January 1591.

Albrycht Radziwiłł, Grand Marshal of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, also enjoyed Sigismund's favour for a brief period of time. Following his disappointment with Leśniowolski, states Leitsch, Sigismund looked for an advisor in whom he could place his trust and who was not hostile towards the Habsburgs. The Grand Marshal seemed to be particularly well-suited to perform the role. Like all members of the Radziwiłł family, he was well-disposed to the House of Habsburg. He was included in the King's matrimonial and abdication plans and endorsed them greatly, but he died soon after the King's wedding (13 July 1592).

Stanisław Krasicki and his son Marcin served as the Queen's chief stewards. Stanisław was a courtier already during the reign of Sigismund Augustus, holding the post of the King's secretary. In 1592 he was appointed to the position of Queen Anna's Chief Steward. However, it is difficult to agree with Leitsch's opinion that he had no time to exercise this function as he actually served as the Crown Field Quartermaster. Stanisław Krasicki quit his military position in 1593 to become Castellan of Przemyśl (p. 1945). It is only his appointment to the post of the Queen's Chief Steward that allows one to regard him as enjoying the King's confidence. His son, Marcin, had been a royal courtier from at least 1592. He participated in Queen Constance's wedding in 1605, and it was in the same year that he became her car-

[2] In the years 1589–90 Sigismund considered abdicating the Polish throne in order to consolidate his power in Sweden after the expected death of his father, John III Vasa.

ver. He accompanied the queen on her trip to Wilno (Vilnius) in 1609. In practice, he exercised the function of the Queen's Chief Steward, since Lew Sapieha, who formally held this office, actually stayed with the king at Smolensk. From 1616 when he took up the post of the starosta of Przemyśl and Castellan of Lwów (L´viv), he rarely appeared at court. Nevertheless he remained on good terms with the Queen and in 1630 he was promoted to Palatine of Podlasie. He must have rendered outstanding services to Ferdinand II, since the latter conferred on him the title of Count (on 5 July 1631), but there is no evidence to suggest that he won Sigismund's special confidence. Nevertheless, the King could rely on the Krasickis at least for his contacts with the Habsburgs.

Mikołaj Wolski, the Grand Marshal of the Crown, certainly ranked among the king's most trusted men. His long stay at the Imperial Court and the support he gave Ernst, but not Maximilian, during the third royal election in 1587 predisposed him to become the King's trusted advisor. According to the account of the Brandenburg envoy Michael Gise, Wolski was influential as early as 1595. Despite this, his was a slow progression. Twice, in 1593 and 1596, he unsuccessfully sought the position of the Court Marshal of the Crown. It is thought that the Queen was unconvinced of his ability to successfully fill this position (p. 1951). It was not until 1600 that Wolski was promoted to a public office. Three years later, and again seeking the Grand Marshalcy of the Crown, he was obstructed in his efforts by Zygmunt Myszkowski. Leitsch argues that Jan Zamoyski's attempts[3] to persuade the King to approve Wolski's nomination proved counterproductive and actually frustrated Wolski's efforts. This, however, throws into doubt the opinion that Wolski genuinely enjoyed Sigismund's confidence. The Queen's dislike of Wolski may have been crucial here. However, it is noteworthy that at elsewhere Leitsch suggests that the Archduchess supported him. These contradictory opinions are never resolved in the book.

Leitsch writes that Wolski's relations with both Grand Marshals Zygmunt Myszkowski and Krzysztof Monwid Dorohostajski were far from cordial. This, states the author, was probably the result of disputes over authority. In my opinion, this needs to be interpreted as reflecting the rivalry within the group of regalists who surrounded Sigismund. When Wolski took up the office of Grand Marshal in 1615, he was already sixty-five years old and could no longer spend much time at court. Sigismund III had previously dispatched him on a variety of secret diplomatic missions. For example, in 1613 Wolski was involved in negotiating the so-called family pact with Emperor Maciej. During his pilgrimages to Częstochowa, the King often visited him in Krzepice. Such a conduct indicates that the ruler placed a great deal of trust in Wolski.

[3] Jan Zamoyski (1542–1605) the Chancellor and Grand Hetman of the Crown. Although during the election he supported Sigismund III's candidacy for the Polish throne, later he usually remained in opposition to the King.

The Crown Chamberlain, Andrzej Bobola, was among Sigismund III's few confidants who did not speak German. Leitsch is wrong to assert that Bobola was appointed to his office in 1606 (p. 1962). The mistake is all the more surprising because in dating Bobola's appointment, the author relied on *Spis Urzędników Centralnych* (the List of Central Officials) which clearly indicates that the nomination must have taken place between 14 February and 22 March 1607.[4] Relying on the testimony given by Claudio Rangoni, the papal nuncio, one may argue that Bobola managed to secure a position of great influence as early as 1599. He was well-liked and remained on friendly terms with a great many individuals (Dorohostajski, Krzysztof Piorun Radziwiłł, Bernard Maciejowski, Piotr Skarga). Leitsch is, therefore, justified in ascribing him a pivotal role in shaping the king's policy on the distribution of land and offices.

Krzysztof Monwid Dorohostajski, the Grand Marshal of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, was one of the ruler's few Protestant favourites. The author maintains that Sigismund must have tested his loyalty, which in his opinion is illustrated by the fact that he kept him in the position of the Court Marshal for two years while that of the Grand Marshal remained vacant. Dorohostajski was favourably inclined towards the Habsburgs. He tried to inform the Protestant branch of the Radziwiłł family of everything that went on at court.

Zygmunt Myszkowski, the Grand Marshal of the Crown, came from a family with a tradition of court service dating back to the reign of Sigismund I the Old (1506–48). Leitsch finds it surprising that Myszkowski, although not yet influential, was invited to take part in Sigismund's wedding in 1592. However, what the author does not take into account is the fact that Myszkowski already held the office of starosta of Piotrków, participated as an envoy at the Coronation Sejm (Diet) (1587/88) and the Inquisition Sejm (1592), and served as deputy (judge) to the Crown Tribunal, all of which suggests that his position among the Polish nobility was already significant. Leitsch rightly remarks that the acceptance by Myszkowski of the name Gonzaga was met with disapproval by his fellow Polish nobles, while he was also attacked for using the title Margrave of Mirów (p. 1972).[5] The author also engages in a polemic with Urszula Augustyniak who claimed that Myszkowski's stay abroad in the years 1607–09 was connected with the task of neutralizing the anti-royal agitation carried out by Janusz Radziwiłł. However, Radziwiłł was actually abroad from September 1609 to November 1610 and they only met once, at the royal court in France. Myszkowski was actively involved in the conduct of foreign policy. Sigismund valued his connections and often used him for secret missions. With dignitaries from the Duchy of Mantua and Brandenburg-Prussia, he managed to establish especially influential relationships. The Electors thought highly of him, paying for his service as much as 25,000 florins. Only the chancellor, Jan Zamoyski, received more money from the rulers of Brandenburg

[4] *Urzędnicy*, vol. 10, Kórnik, 1992, no. 704.

[5] Zygmunt Myszkowski was in 1597 accepted as a member of Gonzaga family of Mantua and in 1596 Pope Clement VIII conferred on him the title of Margrave.

than Myszkowski. In Zamoyski's case, he was paid some 40,000 Polish złotys. The fact that Myszkowski failed to establish good relations with Rome or that he was on poor terms with papal nuncios did not hinder his relationship with Sigismund. He avoided displeasing the King even when he advised against Sigismund's marriage to Constance, as he was convinced that it was likely to cause domestic political problems. Besides, he disliked Archduchess Mary. As Leitsch stresses, in spite of being on very good terms with the monarch, Myszkowski never succeeded in becoming a second Zamoyski, although that was the position to which he undoubtedly aspired. His premature death is explained by his frequent poor health.

Leitsch doubts whether the Grand Marshal of the Crown, Łukasz Opaliński, was able to influence Sigismund's decisions to the same extent as those mentioned above (p. 1983). He is justified in arguing that not all royal marshals were able to win Sigismund's confidence. The fact that the ruler, while seeking refuge from the plague, took Opaliński with him to Tykocin in 1630 might be seen as evidence that the Crown Marshal was in fact close to Sigismund. A letter dating from June 1628 from Krzysztof Radziwiłł to Stanisław Kurosz seems to confirm Opaliński's ability to influence the monarch's decisions concerning the distribution of land and offices. In the letter Radziwiłł reveals that Opaliński was connected with the group which was being formed around Stanisław Łubieński, Maksymilian Przerębski, and Wolski. Writing in 1620 to the Elector that Opaliński will secure him better access to the King, Schwarzenberg provided evidence that Sigismund's favour could often be gained through the agency of Opaliński. However, as Leitsch emphasizes, the Marshal was not in the pay of the Elector, which in the author's opinion proves that he was not able to influence Sigismund (p. 1986). However, it may be argued that Opaliński simply did not promote Brandenburg interests. Surprisingly, in presenting the figure of Opaliński, the author fails to mention his good command of German or the service he rendered to Sigismund as the royal representative to the *sejmik* (dietine) of the palatinates of Great Poland at Środa.

The Crown Referendary and Castellan of Sieradz, Maksymilian Przerębski, is dealt with by Leitsch in a half-hearted manner. The author notes that Przerębski's relatives, namely Hieronim Rozdrażewski, the bishop of Cujavia, and Zygmunt Myszkowski helped his career. It is surprising that Leitsch makes no mention of Przerębski's part in the legation dispatched to Austria with a view to bringing Queen Constance to Poland. The omission is noteworthy because the author generally pays close attention to such details. However, Leitsch has stressed Przerębski's role in Polish diplomacy, especially with regard to the relations with the Habsburgs. That the King had a high opinion of him is testified not only by his part in diplomatic legations and the functions he exercised at the Queen's court, but also by the great number of crown lands he received from the King, of which only the *starostwo* of Piotrków is mentioned by Leitsch.

The King's confidants included several ecclesiastical chancellors and vice-chancellors of the Crown. It is hard to agree with Leitsch's assertion that

Sigismund kept Bishop Wawrzyniec Gembicki at a distance. Their correspondence clearly shows that the ruler had a liking for him. Sigismund's relationship with Piotr Tylicki, the Vice-Chancellor of the Crown and later bishop of Kraków, certainly passed through different phases, and one may accept the view that the King never ceased to resent Tylicki's dealings with Zamoyski (p. 1992).

According to Leitsch, among Sigismund's confidants one needs to count Jan Tarnowski, Maciej Pstrokoński, Henryk Firlej, Andrzej Lipski, Stanisław Łubieński and Jakub Zadzik. The first of them, Jan Tarnowski, had served as Crown Referendary since the reign of Stephen Báthory (1576–86), to whom he owed his post. Displaying unswerving loyalty to Sigismund from the very outset of his reign, in 1592 Tarnowski was elevated to the vice-chancellorship of the Crown. In spite of the fact that he did not want to commit himself to advancing Habsburg interests, in 1598 he became the bishop of Poznań and in 1603 Primate of Poland. This rapid advancement is evidence that Sigismund placed a great deal of trust in him.

In Leitsch's opinion, Maciej Pstrokoński, the Chancellor of the Crown, was not so much the King's confidant as his loyal aide. He began his career as Sigismund's secretary in 1588. Although he could rely on the support of Stanisław Karnkowski, Hieronim Rozdrażewski and Jan Tarnowski, it took him eleven years to come into the office of the Crown Referendary. Not long after, he was consecrated bishop of Przemyśl. A turning point in his career came in 1605 when he showed an unswerving loyalty to the King.[6] In the same year he was appointed as Crown Vice-Chancellor while it was obvious that he remained an opponent of the old Chancellor. In 1606 he succeeded Zamoyski. During the anti-royal rebellion (*rokosz*) he defended the King, but, unlike Myszkowski, advocated accommodation with the rebels.

Henryk Firlej, the Crown Vice-Chancellor and Primate, descended from a magnate family, which Leitsch suggests may have facilitated his career, although in comparison with others, Firlej did not progress quickly. In articulating this view, the author fails to see that this was the case only until 1613. From that year onwards, his career proceeded rapidly. In 1613, while holding the office of the Crown Referendary, he was appointed to the position of Grand Secretary, and rose in the same year to the Vice-Chancellorship of the Crown. In 1616 he received the bishopric of Łuck which was not as impoverished as the author suggests. A year later Firlej became the bishop of Płock and in the years 1624–26 he occupied the post of the Primate of Poland. The author argues that there is no evidence to suggest that he was one of Sigismund's confidants. However, and as Leitsch writes, Firlej was close to Queen Constance, especially during her stay in Wilno in the years 1611–12 (p. 2002). It is this relationship with the Queen which may explain why his career suddenly gained momentum and made such rapid progress. It is also worth noting that Firlej was on very good terms with

[6] In 1605, the opposition embarked on virulent attacks against Sigismund in connection with his plans to marry Archduchess Constance.

Bobola, which is attested to by the fact that Bobola's last will was validated in his presence (26 April 1612).[7]

Andrzej Lipski, the Crown Chancellor and the bishop of Kraków, was also the Queen's protégé. He began his career as a royal notary in 1598 and in 1617 he became the bishop of Łuck. It is interesting to note that his succession to the see took place while he served as Sigismund's secretary and not, as was common practice, as the holder of a dignitary office. He earned much dislike because of his haughtiness, but he had a good rapport with the royal family, even though he did not always approve of Sigismund's policies. In 1630, for example, he favoured offering the Grand Hetmanship of Lithuania to Krzysztof Radziwiłł (p. 2007). That he was deeply attached to the royal family is clearly seen in his decision to bequeath to the family all his savings. From 1605 onwards he was entrusted with increasingly important tasks. The king valued him as an advisor and he was active in supporting royal diplomatic efforts, especially when it came to the relations with the Habsburgs, even earning the Emperor's gratitude.

Just like Firlej and Lipski, Stanisław Łubieński, the Vice-Chancellor of the Crown and bishop of Płock, was also the Queen's protégé (p. 2008). Supported by Pstrokoński and Gembicki, he made his way into the royal chancellery in 1593 and gradually managed to win the king's confidence. However, he had to wait thirty years before he was nominated to his first bishopric in Łuck. One may suppose that Sigismund tested his loyalty and usefulness. The author believes that Łubieński had a very good relationship with Sigismund. This point of view is apparently confirmed by the fact that the King, while fleeing from the plague in 1625, took Łubieński with him. However, one may counter this line of argument by saying that in 1625 the bishop of Łuck already served as the Vice-Chancellor of the Crown and the king simply needed him to be in his presence. To be sure, Leitsch does not neglect to mention Łubieński's address to the Polish Sejm that met in Thorn (Toruń) in 1626, in which the Chancellor recommended John Casimir, Sigismund's younger son, as the successor to the throne, but he fails to explain the background details of the address. Leitsch also chose to ignore the fact that Łubieński failed to climb into the position of Chancellor and had to satisfy himself with one more bishopric, that of Płock, which he received in 1627 and in which he remained until the end of his life. In my opinion, this is evidence that he fell out of Sigismund's favour. Also worthy of note in this context is the fact that Stanisław Łubieński's brother, Maciej, who was definitely less intelligent and qualified, managed to rise to the rank of primate.

Jakub Zadzik, the Chancellor of the Crown and the bishop of Kraków, owed the launch of his career to Bobola. It was in his capacity as royal secretary that

[7] 'Oblata testamentu przez Andrzeja Bobolę, podkomorzego koronnego', 26 April 1612, AGAD, MK 153, fol. 433.

he stayed with the king for more than a year at Smolensk.[8] Leitsch does not omit this element from his biography but he attached no weight to it. Zadzik's correspondence illustrates that he undertook a huge amount of work as royal secretary and brought himself to Sigismund's attention as an able organizer. As a result, it was as early as 1613 that he became Grand Secretary of the Crown. As such, he was put in charge of the royal chancellery. However, it was not until twelve years later that he rose to the rank of Vice-Chancellor of the Crown. Not long after, he was appointed Crown Chancellor. As Leitsch emphasizes, on several occasions Zadzik accompanied as he escaped from the plague (p. 2013). Moreover, he is known to have had good relationships with Anna Vasa and Prince Władysław.

Leitsch hesitates to include Stanisław Żółkiewski and Stanisław Miński among Sigismund's confidants. The first, the Field Hetman of the Crown, was until 1605 an ardent adherent of Zamoyski. However, during the rebellion he decided to take the side of the King and from then on was regarded as the monarch's loyal servant. For a long time Sigismund refrained from offering him the post of Grand Hetman of the Crown, which could be viewed as an indication of Żółkiewski's failure to win Sigismund's favour. The problem with such an argument is that in 1615 the papal nuncio, Francesco Diotallevi, wrote that no one had such a hold over the ruler as Żółkiewski. His elevation to the ranks of Chancellor and Grand Hetman in 1618 was intended as a political demonstration. Leitsch believes that the hetman was looked upon by the king as a reliable servant who advocated a pro-Habsburg policy, and also suggests that his appointment to the office of chancellor was supported by Ursula and by the queen (p. 2017). The author admits that Miński, the Vice-Chancellor of the Crown, although he, too, enjoyed the monarch's trust and adhered to his pro-Habsburg policy, was not entrusted with significant tasks. Thus, according to Leitsch, Miński was not a man of great political influence. If this was the case then one must ask why Miński was given the position at all. A potential answer is that Sigismund simply had no better candidates at that time.

In the end, Leitsch decided to leave Żółkiewski and Miński out of the group of Sigismund's confidants, but he added to it Hieronim Gostomski, Lew Sapieha, Sebastian Lubomirski, Hieronim Wołłowicz, Szczęsny Kryski, Stanisław Radziejowski and Albrycht Stanisław Radziwiłł. The Austrian scholar fails to devote much attention to the first of this group. Nothing is mentioned about the court experience gained by Gostomski as Sigismund August's courtier. The author also fails to address his family's attitude towards the Habsburgs. Nevertheless, it is noted that he supported Sigismund during parliamentary debates. Surprisingly, the author also fails to tackle the issue of Gostomski's legation to Emperor Rudolph II in 1601, but he does mention his involvement in court festivities. Moreover, Leitsch does not see that Gostomski provided his brothers with openings for great careers, which suggests that he wielded some influence.

[8] In the years 1609–11 Sigismund undertook the siege of Smolensk which was in the hands of Muscovy.

The Vice-Chancellor of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, Lew Sapieha, was quick to gain Sigismund's favour. As early as June 1588 di Capua, the papal nuncio, remarked in his letter to Rome that Sapieha enjoyed the King's great confidence. In April 1589 he was promoted to the Lithuanian chancellorship. The chancellor knew how to remain on good terms with the monarch. On his visits to Warsaw, he would bring with him a small orchestra which he shared with the King. Moreover, Sapieha always stayed in the Royal Castle. The author stresses the fact that his loyalty cost Sigismund dearly, as from 1589 to 1633 Sapieha leased the Lithuanian customs. Sapieha was initially unsupportive of the monarch's marriage to Archduchess Anna (p. 2023), but later he became her chamberlain. He also occupied this post at the court of Queen Constance, but in neither case did he actually perform his duties. He remained in good relationships with Ursula and Sigismund's second wife.

Sebastian Lubomirski, Castellan of Wojnicz, was first of all involved in economic affairs. He accumulated great wealth and managed to win Sigismund's trust by lending him considerable sums. In the years 1589–92 he leased salt mines. His role consisted mainly of handling the ruler's financial matters. He must have been close to the court, since he accompanied the Queen on her trip to Kraków in 1592 and in 1595 he was dispatched as an envoy to Archduchess Mary. He was at first sceptical about Sigismund's marriage to Constance, but he soon accepted the ruler's choice and managed to develop a good relationship with the new Queen.

Hieronim Wołłowicz, the Vice-Chancellor of Lithuania and starosta of Samogitia (Żmudź, Žemaitija), stayed at court for many years. Between 1600 and 1618 he served as the Court Treasurer and then the Treasurer of Lithuania. The author emphasizes the fact that he was adept at handling royal couple's financial affairs.

The author is mistaken in following Szymon Starowolski, by stating that the Chancellor of the Crown, Szczęsny Kryski, died on 10 February 1618. In reality, Kryski had died by 22 February 1617.[9] The mistake found in Starowolski is probably a typographical error and the Chancellor may have died exactly one year earlier. One also cannot agree with the opinion that Kryski came from an ordinary, moderately wealthy noble family, since he was the son of the Palatine of Mazovia and the great-grandson of the Palatine of Płock. Leitsch also thinks that the future chancellor's acquaintance with Myszkowski helped his career. Nevertheless, he doubts whether — as is believed by Czesław Lechicki — he was, along with Bobola, among Sigismund's confidants.

The author has failed to offer sufficient evidence to support the argument that Stanisław Radziejowski, the Palatine of Łęczyca, enjoyed Sigismund's great

[9] As Andrzej Szołdrski informed Wawrzyniec Gembicki in a letter sent from Warsaw on 22 February 1617: 'Pogrzeb nieboszczyka pana Canclerza 16 martii odprawować się bendzie' (the Chancellor's funeral ceremony will be celebrated on 16 March) Stockholm Riksarkivet, Extranea IX Polen, vol. 100.

confidence. His long service at the King's court and at that of Anna Jagiellon can hardly be regarded as settling the question definitely. He was actively involved in diplomatic activity, and he is known to have often hosted the royal family on his estate at Radziejowice, which supports the view that he had a good relationship with the King. The acceptance of this view is further encouraged by the fact that when he was about to leave for Italy in 1615, the Queen equipped him with a letter of recommendation to her sister, the Duchess of Tuscany.

Undoubtedly, as Leitsch stresses, it was Albrycht Radziwiłł's birth and position as a magnate that allowed him to make such swift progress during his career. He became Vice-Chancellor of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania at the age of 26, and was then promoted only four years later to the rank of Chancellor. Radziwiłł was Sigismund's faithful aide. In 1619 he accompanied Prince Władysław during his campaign in Silesia and five years later on his trip abroad. This certainly attests to the great trust which Sigismund was prepared to put in him.

Leitsch encountered great difficulties in trying to single out a group of spiritual lords among Sigismund's confidants. The most serious problems are caused by five clergymen whom one cannot, in the face of insufficient evidence, regard as the King's closest aides. The first of them is Paweł Wołucki, the bishop of Cujavia. He had a good relationship with the King, but Sigismund did not value him as much as he did Gembicki or Marcin Szyszkowski. Without trying to resolve the issue definitively, it is worth mentioning that he did manage to secure seats in the Senate for his brothers. This is an indication of political influence. The other clergyman is the bishop of Chełmno, Jan Kuczborski. Leitsch is justified in expressing some doubts about the role this bishop may have played. In dealing with the figure of Kuczborski, it is worth rectifying several inaccuracies that crept into the author's account. According to Leitsch it was only from 1613 that Kuczborski was Regent (a high official in the greater and lesser chancellery of the Crown, responsible for the drafting and checking of documents) of the Crown Chancellery. He was in fact then a Regent in the greater chancellery. However he served as Regent in the Minor Chancellery earlier, from no later than 1610.[10] It is easy to see that he occupied both these posts when the Great Seal remained in the hands of Kryski who must have trusted him enough to employ him in one or other part of the Chancellery. The date of his elevation to the see of Chełmno is also inaccurate. This did not take place on 28 April 1614 (p. 2040) but on 26 March 1614.[11]

The group of spiritual lords whose role in the reign of Sigismund III, according to Leitsch, remains obscure, also comprises the bishop of Płock, Hieronim Cielecki. Enumerating the offices held by Cielecki, the author omits the

[10] He is mentioned as occupying the post on 17 August 1610. Thus, he served as regent three years earlier than is suggested by Leitsch. He then accompanied the king at Smolensk. MK 153, fol. 201v.

[11] We know about this from the letter Tylicki sent to W. Gembicki from Krakow on 22 March 1614: Stockholm Riksarkivet, Extranea IX Polen, vol. 103.

post of the Regent of the Minor Chancellery. Cielecki exercised this function as early as 1611.[12] He was not be appointed to the position of Referendary on 22 April 1615 as he already held this post on 26 March 1614.[13] He is likely to have received the office in 1613 which is when Firlej advanced to the rank of chancellor. The author writes that he handled the Queen's financial affairs and served as chamberlain for all of her children. It is difficult to find an example of a greater level of trust being placed in an official. However, Leitsch argues that there is no evidence of Cielecki's political significance (p. 2041). The problem is that this evidence does exist. In 1622, contrary to the wishes of the Vice-Chancellor, Wacław Leszczyński, he arranged for the office of the starosta of Koło to be assumed by Łukasz Opaliński junior. As he wrote to the Court Marshal: 'Often, when I recalled Your Lordship when talking to Her Majesty the Queen and Mistress Urszula, I was always put off with the response: Fear not for the Lord Marshal, Sir' (Z królową JejMcią i Panną Urszulą częstokroć przypominając WMci mówiłem, zawsze w tym byłem potkany i odprawiony: O Pana Marszałka nie frasuj się WM).[14] In 1618, he seemed certain to become Vice-Chancellor of the Crown. If Radziwiłł's testimony is to be relied on, the King wanted to promote him to this position. Unfortunately, Cielecki fell victim to an intrigue at court and the vice-chancellorship was given to Andrzej Lipski instead.[15]

It is surprising that the author counts Tobiasz Małachowski, the Royal Secretary and the abbot of Paradyż, among the group under discussion. Paweł Piasecki, the bishop of Kamieniec and later of Przemyśl, is also mentioned as belonging to the group in question.

In the end, the author decided to qualify the following people as the King's confidants: Hieronim Rozdrażewski, Jerzy Radziwiłł, Szymon Rudnicki, Andrzej Opaliński, Marcin Szyszkowski, Jan Wężyk and Jan Lipski. The first of them served as the bishop of Cujavia for as long as nineteen years (1581–1600). As is stressed by the author, he was the mainstay of the Habsburg party. Nevertheless, in relations with the Emperor he represented Polish interests and the King plainly trusted him, as he did not hesitate to inform him of his abdication plans.

During the election of 1587 Cardinal Jerzy Radziwiłł supported Archduke Maximilian, but by 1589 he was a supporter of Sigismund. Leitsch argues that in the face of the Emperor's ill-feeling towards Sigismund, the latter was eager to take advantage of Radziwiłł's good relations with the Habsburgs (p. 2046). The Cardinal participated in the negotiations with Archduke Ernst and was in-

[12] He is mentioned to have occupied the post on 28 October 1611. He also attended the sessions of the diet in 1611, MK 156, fol. 135.

[13] Piotr Tylicki to Wawrzyniec Gembicki, Kraków, 26 March 1614, Stockholm Riksarkivet, Extranea IX Polen, vol. 103; in *Spis Urzędników*, vol. 10, no. 863, the date of 22 April 1615 is given as the earliest date of occupying the office.

[14] Hieronim Cielecki to Łukasz Opaliński, February 1612, BR, MS 2, p. 1130.

[15] Opaliński, *Elita władzy*, p. 81.

volved in the talks concerning Sigismund's matrimonial plans.[16] His close relations with the king are also illustrated by the fact that he baptized Prince Władysław and his sister and, after Wawel Castle was destroyed by fire, he lent the ruler his residence.

The prince-bishop of Warmia, Szymon Rudnicki, had a career typical of a clergyman, holding successively the offices of Royal Secretary, Regent of the Chancellery and Grand Secretary of the Crown before finally securing his important and lucrative prince-bishopric. He took up the position in Warmia in 1605 and remained there until his death in 1621. His close relations with Sigismund can be seen in his consent to grant the coadjutorship of the bishopric to three-year-old Prince Jan Olbracht (p. 2050). One might also add that in 1615 his brother Jan became Castellan of Sieradz.

The author stresses that the career of the bishop of Poznań, Andrzej Opaliński, was facilitated by his descent from a magnate family. However, after his father's death, the Grand Marshal of the Crown, in 1593, Andrzej Opaliński's relatives were either men of little significance or were too young to support his career. The author enumerates a great number of diplomatic missions on which the bishop was sent, regarding it as proof that he enjoyed Sigismund's confidence. However, there is no mention that he served twice as Sigismund's representative to the sejmik of Great Poland at Środa and strongly supported the King during the rebellion. His career after 1607, that is, after he became bishop of Poznań, did not attract Leitsch's interest. Instead, the author merely states that that Opaliński baptized Prince Charles Ferdinand. Does this mean that Andrzej Opaliński fell out of favour with Sigismund? The thing is, however, that, along with Primate Gembicki, Andrzej Opaliński was the mainstay of the royalist party in Great Poland and a brother of the King's other confidant, Łukasz. There is also evidence to suggest that he promoted the careers of others.

The bishop of Kraków, Marcin Szyszkowski, owed his career advancement to Myszkowski, and after the latter's death it was his pro-Austrian attitude and good relations with the Court in Graz that fuelled his career. The ruler showed that he cherished warm feelings for Szyszkowski by allowing him to baptize his children, Alexander and Anna Constance.

According to Franciszek Siarczyński and Jan Korytkowski, Primate Jan Wężyk owed his elevation to the sees of Przemyśl and Poznań, as well as his position as Primate of Poland, to the Queen's support. The author found no evidence that Wężyk was connected with the Queen. Thus, Leitsch maintains that it was by handling Sigismund's correspondence and supervising the preparation of the documents involved in attempts to obtain a cardinalate for Claudio Rangoni, the

[16] In planning his abdication, Sigismund III thought of supporting the Archduke's efforts to obtain the Polish throne. At the same time, the Polish monarch was going to marry Archduchess Anna. It was only the King's most trusted men who were involved in the secret negotiations concerning these plans.

former papal nuncio in Poland, that he managed to win the monarch's favour. The development of his career then needs to be treated as a reward from Sigismund for Wężyk's service.

Jan Lipski served only as the Regent of the Crown Chancellery. Leitsch believes that it was Kryski who in 1617 helped him into the Royal Chancellery. This view is unsustainable, for in 1617 the chancellor was no longer alive. However, it has been rightly noted that Lipski had the backing of Zadzik (p. 2057). That he enjoyed Sigismund's confidence is supported by Lipski's role in securing a cardinal's hat for the papal nuncio, Giovanni Battista Lancellotti. Given the fact that he became the bishop of Chełmno as late as 1635, one may find it surprising that the author decided to deal with him in this chapter.

It is among the secretaries and courtiers that the author managed to find another group of Sigismund's confidants. Undoubtedly, by being in constant touch with Sigismund, one was able to ingratiate oneself in his favour and exert some influence over him (pp. 2060–61). Leitsch is unclear as how to treat Krzysztof Koryciński, the King's long-term secretary and courtier. He is able to discern some signs of the ruler's confidence in Koryciński life and career, for example, his participation in the legation to Spain in 1605. This, however, in Leitsch's opinion is not enough to regard Koryciński as the ruler's confidant.

Leitsch concludes that the group of the King's confidants recruited from among his secretaries and courtiers comprised the following: Franciszek Rylski, Stanisław Fogelweder, Jan Bojanowski, Andrzej Bolko, Mikołaj and Zygmunt Opacki. Franciszek Rylski was only the King's bedchamber servant. However, he was one of the pages whom Catherine Jagiellon, Sigismund's mother, took with her to Finland. It is hardly surprising, then, that he initially attended the most secret meetings held by the monarch. Leitsch is of the opinion that his role did not go beyond offering the ruler advice on financial matters. He was made responsible for the royal land holdings in Little Poland (Małopolska) in 1592, and from that moment on he became involved in the administration of the royal household. It is suggested that he became starosta of Hrubieszów in 1588, but he was actually given that office in Kamionek.[17] Leitsch also fails to note that Rylski served as the Royal Secretary.[18]

Stanisław Fogelweder, the abbot of Miechów, was appointed in 1567 to the position of Royal Secretary. He is notable as he was the only burgher in this group of Sigismund's confidants. During the first two elections held 1572–75, Fogelweder supported the Habsburg candidates. However, in relations with the Habsburgs, he nevertheless represented Polish interests. Both Anna Jagiellon and Sigismund often dispatched him on secret diplomatic missions, while the King's great confidence in him is also clearly seen in Sigismund's decision to entrust him with the education of his children.

[17] Nomination, 2 November 1588, MK 135, fol. 326.
[18] Recorded as such on 30 April 1589, ibid., fol. 571.

Jan Bojanowski, secretary and bedchamber servant, was a Protestant, and this important detail is absent from Leitsch's account.[19] The argument that Sigismund gave him only a few villages, and that this explains the large amount of time he spent at court serving as Radziwiłł's agent, is not quite correct (p. 2073). On 15 February 1588 he was granted a huge annual salary of 1,000 florins from Riga[20] and in 1595 became the starosta of Bobrujsk, which suggests that Sigismund appreciated his service.

Andrzej Bolko served as *starszy nad srebrem* (senior silverware officer). He was often entrusted with huge sums of money, which leaves one convinced of the trust the ruler placed in him. Leitsch believes that after 1606 Bolko left for Bohemia, but in fact it was as late as 17 July 1609 that he received a mill at Ruda in the district of Warsaw.[21]

The Chamberlain of Warsaw, Mikołaj Opacki, was Catherine Jagiellon's page, so the monarch knew him well and trusted him. He was responsible for the King's jewellery and in 1603 he was appointed as governor of the royal lands in Małopolska. This office yielded a considerable income for Opacki. Worthy of mention are other examples of royal favour. The most important of them was the title of the starosta of Piaseczno.[22] In 1598 he became Chamberlain of Warsaw,[23] an office reserved for the sons of great lords, or for those who enjoyed the ruler's confidence. It was usually the first rung in their career. From 1619 Zygmunt Opacki served as Queen Constance's valet. Sigismund relied on him for maintaining diplomatic contacts with the Habsburgs and in 1622 the queen leased out to him the *starostwo* of Latowice with a rent of 4,000 florins, which the author rightly interprets as evidence for Opacki's good relationship with the royal couple. This is also suggested by the fact that he was still a young man when he was given the post of Chamberlain of Warsaw.[24]

Leitsch also tries to identify Sigismund's confidants among those who were connected with the court of both Queens. Among them was Ruggiero Salomon. He arrived in Poland along with Queen Anna and after her death he became the king's chaplain. This circle also includes Hans Lobmair, who in 1596 became the queen's gatekeeper and was later given the task of administering the property the queen would inherit should her husband die, and Jan Piotrowski who was responsible for silver jewellery.

---

[19] In 1575 he probably established the Protestant church in Bojanów, see Krystyna Opalińska, 'Szlachta różnowiercza i pozostałości po jej księgozbiorach w zbiorach BUW (XVI w.)', in *Księgozbiory szlacheckie XVI–XVII wieku. Kolekcje historyczne*, 2 vols, Warsaw, 2004–09, vol. 2, p. 201.

[20] For the granting of an annual salary of 1,000 florins from Riga see under 17 February 1558: MK 134, fol. 167.

[21] For the granting of the mill to Andrzej Bolko see, 17 July 1609, MK 153, fol. 114.

[22] Nomination, 22 July 1604, MK 148, fol. 383; he ceded the *starostwo* of Piaseczno to his son Sigismund, 8 January 1619, MK 163, fol. 135.

[23] The earliest appearance comes from 28 June 1598: MK 142, fol. 170.

[24] Nomination: 17 September 1623, MK 169, fol. 270.

Mikołaj Kołaczkowski deserves closer attention. At first, he was involved in supplying the court with food and in 1592 he entered the service of Queen Anna. In 1610, in his capacity as the Queen's Equerry and Master of the Kitchen, he was granted tenancy of the *starostwo* of Ujście and Piła, and this was the land that Anna would inherit if Sigismund died. Hence, Kołaczkowski may be assumed to have enjoyed the queen's great confidence. Leitsch presumes that Kołaczkowski may have died in 1635, and he is known to have died between 3 February and 8 June 1635.[25]

The last group dealt with here also includes foreigners who were not in Polish service. In this context Leitsch mentions Pierre de Lecolle. He arrived in Poland from Sweden, along with Sigismund. Sigismund relied on him for dispatching his correspondence. Lindorm Nilsson Bonde, was the King's Swedish secretary and was active in secret diplomatic efforts.

The King's cousin, Count Gustav Brahe, grew up with Sigismund. In the years 1587–92 he was among Sigismund's closest advisors, but later he lost the King's confidence. Claudio Rangoni was also one of the foreigners whom Leitsch decided to count among Sigismund's confidants. He was the only papal nuncio whom the ruler treated almost like a member of his family.

Andrzej Köne, a citizen of Danzig (Gdańsk) who was known by the name of Jaski, managed to win the king's trust in spite of the fact that he was also the Elector's agent. Sigismund even embarked on some religious disputations with him. In 1604 Köne entered Polish service, thus serving two masters, but Leitsch leaves unresolved the issue of to which one he was most loyal.

In conclusion, it is worth stressing that Leitsch considers the list of those in receipt of payment from the Elector as the most important criterion by which to judge whether someone was close to Sigismund or not. The author believes that the Elector was willing to pay money only to those who wielded significant influence over the king. One might see merit in such an argument, but such a list does not include all those whom the King was prepared to trust. Leitsch himself admits that some of the ruler's confidants took no money from the Hohenzollerns. Opaliński and Bobola are good examples of those close to Sigismund who received no imperial payments. Another way of identifying Sigismund's confidants is by tracing those who maintained correspondence with the Habsburgs or were involved in secret diplomatic missions. One might gain the King's favour in such a context by having a good command of German. Similarly, proving one's knowledge of, and one's good taste in, art and music, or even being a good dancer, would all be advantageous for an ambitious candidate. Of course, one's unswerving loyalty to Sigismund was of crucial importance. Leitsch gives examples of the persons with whom the king was disappointed and who lost his confidence. One can mention here Marcin Leśniowolski or Paweł Piasecki.

[25] He was still alive on 3 February 1635 and must have died by 8 June 1635. *Urzędnicy*, vol. 1, part 2, Wrocław, 1987, no. 556; Krzysztof Chłapowski, *Starostowie w Wielkopolsce, na Kujawach i Mazowszu 1565–1696 (materiały źródłowe)*, Warsaw, 2007, p. 45.

The public activity of the ruler's confidants is not discussed at all in this work. Moreover people like Szczęsny Kryski, Stanisław Miński, Łukasz Opaliński, or Stanisław Radziejowski were deeply engaged in parliamentary activity, thus making themselves even more useful to the monarch. It was in parliament — to a greater degree than in secret diplomatic activity — that one had a chance to prove one's loyalty to the king. Leitsch notices the significance of the work by those in the royal chancellery connected with diplomatic efforts, but neglects activity connected with the preparation for sessions of the sejm, or with the participation of royal secretaries in parliamentary sessions.

Two questions arise here: whether Leitsch omitted any protagonists from his account of Sigismund's confidants, and whether Leitsch has added to the group anyone who should remain absent. In a few cases Leitsch does seem to have been mistaken as he has included in the group figures who were not the ruler's confidants. This can be said above all of Georg Schiechel who was certainly not among the King's most trusted advisors. We can also raise doubts about the inclusion of Stanisław Radziejowski and Jan Lipski. In contrast, one should add to the group the Jesuit, Piotr Skarga, and Wacław Kiełczewski. The latter spent many years at the king's court, was Castellan of Łęczyca, and served as the Chamberlain of the Crown. Polish historians are inclined to rank the Jesuit, Bernard Gołyński among the ruler's confidants, but Leitsch holds a different view. He may be right, considering the fact that Gołyński reproached the King's sister for her Lutheran denomination.

It is worth stressing that Leitsch's study provides the reader with an almost complete portrait of Sigismund's confidants. Moreover, Leitsch's archival research has resulted in a great number of interesting details that shed much light on how Sigismund's court functioned.

Edward Opaliński
(Warszawa)
(Translated by Artur Mękarski)

Lidiia Lazurko, *Chasopys 'Kwartalnik Historyczny' i rozvytok pol´skoï istoriohrafiï ostann´oï chverti XIX — pershoï polovyny XX stolittia*, Drohobych, 2010, Redaktsiino-vydavnychyi viddil Drohobyts´koho derzhavnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu imeni Ivana Franka, pp. 282

In 2010 the Ukrainian book market saw the publication of a monograph that may be particularly interesting to Polish readers. The work by Lidiia Lazurko attempts to highlight the general tendencies that shaped historical debates carried out in the pages of the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* in its Lwów (L´viv, Lemberg) period, that is, in the years 1887–1939. Although it is not without defects, this monograph offers a comprehensive account of an important period in the history of Polish (and not only Polish) historiography and of its achievements.

The book is divided into four chapters. The first, entitled 'Istoriohrafiia ta dzherela' (Historiography and primary sources), contains a systematic overview of a rich collection of primary sources and secondary literature on which Lazurko drew in writing her book. Noteworthy are works by both Polish and Ukrainian historians involved in the realization of the research project 'Multicultural historiographical milieu of Lwów in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries'. It is worth stressing that Lazurko was an active participant in this project, which was initiated in 2002 by Jerzy Maternicki and Leonid Zashkil´niak.

The second chapter, entitled 'Stanovlennia, orhanyzatsiini zasady ta osnovni napriamy diial´nosti "Kwartalnika Historycznego" (1887–1939)' (The Formation, Organizational Principles and the Main Directions of the *Kwartalnik Historyczny*) consists of two subchapters covering 1887–1917 and 1917–39 respectively. The most illuminating chapter in the whole volume, it discusses the institutional and personal dimensions of the history of the *Kwartalnik Historyczny*. The line of argument is developed here with great clarity. Lazurko moves smoothly across different layers of complex narrative and displays much skill in placing its various strands — for example, Ksawery Liske's organizational efforts undertaken in the initial phase of the *Kwartalnik*'s publication, or the analysis of various economic data and the journal's statute — into a broader perspective of the development of Polish historiography.

The next two chapters aim to present the scholarly achievements of the historians who contributed to the journal. They are organized according to specific topics. In the third part, 'Vnesok "Kwartalnika Historycznego" v doslidzhennia istoriï Pol´shi' (The *Kwartalnik Historyczny*'s contribution to the study of the Polish history), Lazurko, in offering a systematic analysis of the journal's content, isolates three areas of research and devotes a separate subchapter to each example. They concern respectively: the history of Poland in the Middle Ages, the history of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries and the national history in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. She offers a thorough discussion of the general trends and topics that drew the interest of historians working closely with the *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, stressing their efforts to make the journal meet high scholarly standards. This chapter, too, distinguishes itself through a coherent structure, this coherence being disturbed only by the paragraphs dealing with international affairs (pp. 97–100). These sections would be better placed in the following chapter which is specifically devoted to the discussion of international issues. Although it is a matter of individual preference, the narrative is at certain points too schematic. For instance, there is the specification of subthemes of historical studies, the enumeration of scholars along with their particular scholarly interests and examples of their publications. A better impression is certainly made by those parts of the chapter that give an account of the fierce historiographical controversies surrounding such topics as the origin of the Polish state, the periodization of Polish history or the causes of the fall of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

It is with regard to the fourth chapter that one may have some serious reservations about the volume. These, however, pertain not so much to the chapter's detailed findings as to its general construction. It is entitled 'Nacional´na problematyka na storinkah "Kwartalnika Historycznego"' (National issues in the pages of the *Kwartalnik Historyczny*). Here, Lazurko specifies three thematic blocks, devoted respectively to Polish-Ukrainian, Polish-Lithuanian and Polish-German relations. The very specification of these three groups raises questions to which the chapter gives no satisfactory answers. One wants to ask, for example, where successive historical incarnations of Russia stand relative to the thematic division introduced by the author? Does Lazurko, in leaving Polish-Russian relations out of her account, want to suggest that this problem was only rarely discussed in the pages of the journal? This, however, is clearly inconsistent with the emphasis she places on the importance of the journal's polemics with Russian historiography (pp. 45–46 and 129–30). This is not the only problem one might see here. It is also worthwhile raising the problem of how Lazurko isolates the specific problems she intends to confront. Thus, in trying to identify the principles underlying the way in which she organizes her narrative, one arrives at the conclusion that they are heterogeneous. For example, Polish-Lithuanian relations are discussed in politico-historical terms (the relations with the Great Duchy of Lithuania), while ethnic and geographical criteria are used in the discussion of Polish-Ukrainian relations. The author's discussion of the journal's papers concerning the Middle Ages clearly shows that such an approach is anachronistic. Moreover, it is worth noting here that Lazurko herself stresses the fact that contributions on the Middle Ages rank highly in the scholarly accomplishments of the historians contributing to the *Kwartalnik Historyczny* (p. 123). Only indirectly does Lazurko touch upon the problem of choosing specific topics when carrying out a thematic analysis of primary sources, and she does this while giving an account of a controversy over the validity of the term Ukraine/Ukrainian (p. 169). In terms of factual information Lazurko, while discussing these three different areas of research, succeeds in fulfilling the task she set herself. However, one must conclude that the construction of the fourth chapter is less clear than the structure of each of the three other chapters, and of crucial importance in this context is the absence of the 'Russian problem' mentioned above. Nonetheless, this shortcoming does not detract from the value of the detailed findings presented in the chapter.

The work is enhanced considerably by tables providing statistical data concerning the content of the subsequent issues of the *Kwartalnik Historyczny*, as well as the role of particular scholars representing different centres of Polish historical thought in giving the journal its professional form. Short biographical notes on all of the journal's editors-in-chief in the years 1887–1939 are an important addition, especially for Ukrainian readers. The author offers valuable information on Ksawery Liske, Oswald Balzer, Aleksander Semkowicz, Fryderyk Papée and other distinguished representatives of 'Polish Clio' in the period under discussion.

The book is impeccably edited. Only rarely do we find inconsistencies, in the spelling of particular terms — *vide*, for example, the term 'idea jagiellońska' (pp. 189–91). This is, however, the only such case in the whole book.

Lazurko's analytical effort has resulted in a monograph that deserves credit for systematizing and augmenting our knowledge of Polish historiography at so significant a point in its development. It is also interesting in that it offers the perspective of an outsider, who has highlighted questions underexplored by Polish scholars. This work by Lidia Lazurko certainly deserves recommendation.

Andrzej Janicki
(Łódź)
(Translated by Artur Mękarski)

GUIDANCE FOR CONTRIBUTORS TO THE ENGLISH-LANGUAGE EDITION OF *KWARTALNIK HISTORYCZNY*

The English-language edition of *Kwartalnik Historyczny* (*KH*) is edited from the School of Slavonic and East European Studies at University College London. Its house style is based on that of the *Slavonic and East European Review*, which is in turn based on the style guide of the Modern Humanities Research Association, available to download at www.mhra.org.uk. Please follow our house style closely when submitting manuscripts. We take a great deal of care in preparing material for publication. All material undergoes a lengthy and thorough editing process. If your article is accepted for publication, we will ask you to help us by correcting any errors of style when sending your electronic version.

I References (footnotes and main text)

References should be cited in footnotes. Please do **not** use the Harvard system of author and date, and do **not** append a bibliography: any 'further reading' to which you wish to draw readers' attention should be mentioned in the text or footnotes at the relevant point, and work you cite directly is mentioned in footnotes in any case, so there will be no need for a bibliography. Use the following styles both for footnoted references and for works directly cited in the main text, paying close attention to punctuation:

a. Books

Give: author/editor (with their full first name, not the initial(s), unless the author habitually uses them), *title*, edition number if relevant, no. of volumes if relevant, place(s) of publication (**not** publisher, unless this is relevant to the argument, for example in an article about the book trade), year(s), volume number if relevant, page reference. For multi-volume works you must give the number of volumes and their inclusive dates of publication, and cite the relevant volume (in Arabic numerals) and page reference. This is particularly important in the case of, for example, Complete or Collected Works, of which there may be several editions in existence. For editions of other writers' work, please give the original author unless this is part of the title. After the title, please also give the editor, translator and so on. For places of publication in the USA, give also the two-letter postal abbreviation of the state (unless published in the city of New York).

> Jarosław Czubaty, *Zasada 'dwóch sumień'. Normy postępowania i granice kompromisu politycznego Polaków w sytuacjach wyboru (1795–1815)*, Warsaw, 2005, p. 401.
>
> Hugo Kołłątaj, *Listy anonima i Prawo polityczne narodu polskiego*, ed. Bogusław Leśnodorski and Helena Wereszycka, 2 vols, Warsaw, 1954, vol. 2, pp. 315–18.
>
> Daniel Stone, *The Polish-Lithuanian State, 1386–1795*, Seattle, WA, 2001, p. 301.
>
> R. J. W. Evans, *The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy: An Interpretation*, 2nd edn, Oxford, 1984, p. 434.

b. Articles/chapters in books

For a chapter in a multi-authored volume, give: author, 'chapter title' in *book title*, editor(s), place of publication, date, page span of chapter (if important) and specific page reference.

Robert Frost, 'Ordering the Kaleidoscope: The Construction of Identities in the Lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth since 1569', in *Power and the Nation in European History*, ed. Len Scales and Oliver Zimmer, Cambridge, 2005, pp. 212–31 (p. 215).

Barbara M. Pendzich, 'Civic Cohesion and Resilience in the Face of Muscovite Occupation', in *Citizenship and Identity in a Multinational Commonwealth: Poland-Lithuania in Context, 1550–1772*, ed. Karin Friedrich and Barbara M. Pendzich, Leiden and Boston, MA, 2009, pp. 103–27 (p. 120).

c. Articles in journals/periodicals

Give: author, 'article title', *journal title*, volume number, year, issue number (especially if each issue is paginated separately), page span (specific page reference). For periodicals give *periodical title* and date (give place of publication only where confusion may arise). Note that we use a comma after the article title and no 'in', as opposed to the style for articles in books, above.

Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz, 'Dyskusje o wolności słowa w czasach stanisławowskich', *KH*, 102, 1995, 1, pp. 53–65 (pp. 56–57).

Quentin Skinner, 'Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas', *History and Theory*, 8, 1969, pp. 3–53 (p. 45).

Note that only the London newspaper *The Times* has a definite article: otherwise *New York Times*, *Slavonic and East European Review*.

d. Theses otherwise unpublished

Follow this style:

Magdalena Ślusarska, 'Problematyka polityczno-społeczna w polskim kaznodziejstwie okolicznościowym w latach 1775–1795', unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Warsaw, 1992, p. 33.

e. Archival sources

Give details of the document, followed by the archive and location, followed by the collection, the reference to the document and page or folio (if relevant). See also 'Repeated references' below for abbreviating archive names.

Minute by Pink, 25 December 1944, The National Archives, London, Foreign Office 371, 43989, R20647.

Stanisław August to Augustyn Deboli, 29 July 1789, AGAD, Warsaw, Zbiór Popielów, 414, fol. 387.

f. Online sources

References to online publications should follow this sequence: author's name, title of item, title of complete work/resource, publication details (vol., issue, date), full address of the resource in angle brackets, date at which the resource was consulted (in square brackets), location of passage cited (in parenthesis):

Graham Gibbs, review of Jonathan Israel, *The Dutch Republic: Its Rise, Greatness and Fall*, Oxford, 1997, *Reviews in History*, August 2009, 〈http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/review/30〉 [accessed 28 January 2000] (para. 13 of 47).

For complete texts, or chapters from complete texts published online with original pagination, the full reference should be given before the online source. For example:

William Shakespeare, *Much Adoe about Nothing*, in *Mr. VVilliam Shakespeares comedies, histories, & tragedies Published according to the true originall copies*, London: Printed by Isaac Iaggard, and Ed. Blount, 1623, p. 117, in *Early English Books Online* ⟨http://eebo.chadwyck.com⟩ [accessed 24 March 2006].

II Repeated references

Please give full reference as above for the first mention. You may use abbreviations for standard reference works (for example *PSB* for *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, *ODNB* for *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*). You may use ibid. (note full stop, not italic) for a repeated reference which immediately follows a reference to the same work, but do **not** use op. cit. For clarity in repeated references, use the author's surname and a shortened form of the title.

a. Books

1st reference: Jarosław Czubaty, *Zasada 'dwóch sumień'. Normy postępowania i granice kompromisu politycznego Polaków w sytuacjach wyboru (1795–1815)*, Warsaw, 2005, p. 401.

Repeated reference: Czubaty, *Zasada 'dwóch sumień'*, p. 25.

b. Chapter in book

1st reference: Robert Frost, 'Ordering the Kaleidoscope: The Construction of Identities in the Lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth since 1569', in *Power and the Nation in European History*, ed. Len Scales and Oliver Zimmer, Cambridge, 2005, pp. 212–31 (p. 215).

Repeated reference: Frost, 'Ordering the Kaleidoscope', p. 229.

c. Article in journal

1st reference: Anna Grześkowiak-Krwawicz, 'Dyskusje o wolności słowa w czasach stanisławowskich', *KH*, 102, 1995, 1, pp. 53–65 (pp. 56–57).

Repeated reference: Grześkowiak-Krwawicz, 'Dyskusje o wolności słowa', p. 60.

d. Archival reference

1st reference: Minute by Pink, 25 December 1944, The National Archives (hereafter TNA), London, Foreign Office (hereafter FO) 371, 43989, R20647.

Repeated reference: Pink, 25 December 1944, TNA FO 371, 43989, R20647.

1st reference: Stanisław August to Augustyn Deboli, 29 July 1789, AGAD, Warsaw, Zbiór Popielów (hereafter ZP), 414, fol. 387.

Repeated reference: Stanisław August to Deboli, 12 August 1789, ZP 414, fol. 398.

If, in an article with a large number of footnotes, a reference is not repeated until well after its first mention, it may occasionally help the reader if you refer back to the original note, for example:

Frost, 'Ordering the Kaleidoscope' (see note 7 above), p. 217.

III Other problems

a. Non-English Titles

Titles of non-English periodicals should be italicized and (if in other alphabets) transliterated. There is no need to give a translation of the title, for example, *Pravda*, *Gazeta Wyborcza*.

Titles of literary and other works discussed should be given in the original, italicized and (if in other alphabets) transliterated. A translation of the title and the date of original publication should appear in parentheses, for example, 'In Dostoevskii's *Prestuplenie i nakazanie* (Crime and Punishment, 1866), we find that...'. Thereafter you may use either the original or translated title but be consistent (and adopt the same style for all works thus cited: do not discuss *Crime and Punishment* in one paragraph and then go on to talk of *Brat´ia Karamazovy*).

b. Capitalization

This is a thorny area, and one that tends to evolve. In general initial capitals should be used with restraint. Please refer to the following for guidance, and if in doubt use lower case.

General: Use capitals for the names of people, places, nationalities, days of the week, months (but not seasons), wars (use 'the First/Second World War' rather than 'World War I/II'), treaties (the Treaty of Versailles), institutions and organizations, unique events (the October Revolution), empires (the British Empire) and parts of books and so on when referred to specifically (Chapter 2, Part IV, Figure 8, Act 3). Do not capitalize adjectival forms (tsarist Russia, imperial Rome), but note that Communism and its derivatives are always capitalized: 'post-Communist' and so on. Points of the compass are not capitalized unless they are abbreviations (N., NE.) or denote specific geographical areas (the North [of England]) or political concepts (the West). Note that adjectival forms are capitalized only if they are part of an official name ('Northern Ireland' but 'northern England') or a political concept ('Western Europe' and, in certain cases, 'South-Eastern Europe' but 'northern Russia' and 'south-western Poland').

In titles of works: English titles capitalize all principal words. German titles capitalize all nouns. French titles capitalize the first word and proper nouns, but if the first word is 'the', then the first noun and any intervening adjective are also capitalized, for example, *Histoire de la peinture en Italie*, *Un début dans la vie*, but *Les Grands Cimetières sous la lune*. Other languages normally only capitalize the first word and proper nouns and the first word of the names of institutions, as in *Lietuvos mokslų akademija*. However, in Polish, all the principal words of names of institutions are capitalized, as in *Polska Akademia Nauk*.

Titles and ranks: Titles and ranks preceding names are capitalized (for example, Tsar Alexander I, Marshal Piłsudski, President Mościcki, Professor Michalski), and also if a specific individual is meant (for example, 'in 1814 the Tsar...', 'the Marshal and the President discussed...'). Otherwise use lower case (early Bulgarian tsars, few Polish kings, most Byzantine emperors).

c. Spelling

Use British, not American, spelling. However, we use '-ize' rather than '-ise' where variant spellings exist. Note, however, that the following words and their variants are always spelled -ise: advertise, advise, analyse, arise, chastise, comprise, compromise, demise, despise, devise, disguise, enterprise, excise, exercise, franchise, improvise, incise, merchandise, supervise, surmise, surprise, televise.

d. Quotations

Use single quotation marks, and double for quotations within quotations: The press attaché reported that 'Gorbachev simply replied "Enough!"'. Note that punctuation falls outside the quotation marks unless the quotation is a complete sentence or ends with a complete sentence (as in the example).

Always give sources (including page reference) of quotations.

When omitting words from quotations, you should indicate this by means of three full stops within brackets: [...]. Ellipses without brackets may imply that the full stops appear in the original. Please retain the original punctuation where possible, and try to make clear where sentences end (by placing full stops either before or after the brackets). If you omit the beginning of a sentence, capitalize the first word following the ellipsis. For example:

> [Complete text of original] Fred was a prince among men in Asia. Even after the disaster in Bukhara, he still had many followers who worshipped him.
>
> Example 1: 'Fred was a prince among men [...]. Even after the disaster [...], he still had many followers'. (Note no need for ellipsis at end as punctuation makes clear the sentence is not complete.)
>
> Example 2: 'Fred [...] had many followers who worshipped him.'
>
> Example 3: 'Fred was a prince among men in Asia. [...] He still had many followers'.

Verse quotations should be given in the original language. Prose quotations should be given in English translation unless they are being used to make a linguistic or stylistic point. When it is considered necessary to provide the original as well as a translation it is usually preferable to provide a translation in the body of the text rather than in a footnote.

Please do **not** modernize the spelling and syntax of quotations from English sources (although if you are quoting from old or middle English you may need to provide a translation). For quotations in other languages you may **either** quote the unmodernized text **or** modernize according to the accepted academic system for the given language.

Quotations longer than four or five lines should be set indented rather than run on in the text. Indented quotations do **not** need quotation marks.

To cut down on the number of footnotes, if you are quoting repeatedly from one work or one author it is acceptable to give page references within the text after the first reference (which should appear in a footnote and give full bibliographical details: then cite short title and make clear that further references will be given in the text).

e. Non-English Words

Italicize non-English words unless they are in common English usage (for example, elite, genre). The abbreviations ibid. and et al. (note full stop) are not italicized.

Words in Cyrillic, Greek, Arabic, Hebrew and so on should be italicized and transliterated (unless you are quoting a substantial passage, in which case it is best not to transliterate).

Capitals in all languages retain their accents.

Names of institutions and organizations are not italicized, for example, Rathaus, Sejm, Duma, Polska Akademia Nauk.

f. Place-Names and Personal Names

Use standard English forms for place-names if they exist in current usage (Copenhagen, Belgrade, Warsaw and so on). If there is no English form, you should either use the current form in the language of the country in question (such as Bratislava) or the form that is most culturally and historically appropriate to the topic (which might well be Pressburg or Pozsony). However, please be consistent. For example, **either** use Wrocław, Gdańsk, Vilnius, Hrodna and L´viv in order to reflect current political boundaries, **or** Breslau, Danzig, Wilno, Grodno and Lwów to reflect the eighteenth-century

cultural context. **Do not** however, mix the principles, as in Wrocław, Danzig, Vilnius, Grodno and Lwów. If necessary, give alternative forms on first mention.

For personal names, give full name on first mention, together with rank or title if appropriate. Saints' names should also be given in English, where they exist (for example, St Francis of Assisi). Standard English forms, if such exist, should also be used for the names of historical monarchs (for example, Ivan the Terrible, Casimir the Great, Ferdinand and Isabella). Otherwise transliterate, but **do not** mix systems within the same name (for example, Alexis or Aleksei Mikhailovich, but not Alexis Mikhailovich). The Polish forms Bolesław, Władysław, Stanisław and so on may be rendered in the original spelling, as their Latin or French variants (Boleslaus, Stanislas and so on) are of debatable status in English.

Names transliterated from Cyrillic **must** be in the house style transliteration, for example, El´tsin not Yeltsin, Lev Tolstoi not Leo Tolstoy, Trotskii not Trotsky, Chaikovskii not Tchaikovsky, Iosif (or I. V.) Stalin not Joseph Stalin.

Names ending in -s, -z or -x have possessives in –'s unless they are from Classical Antiquity, for example, Marx's, Camus's, but Achilles' not Achilles's.

g. Numerals

Spell out numerals from one to ninety-nine, and use figures for 100 and above (but keep 'hundred', 'thousand', 'million' and 'billion' as words if they appear as whole numbers, for example, 'a thousand years ago').

Use figures in percentages: 26 per cent.

Inclusive numerals give the last two digits, for example, 15–17, 123–25, 401–04. This applies to dates; for example: the war of 1914–18. However, please give the full inclusive dates in the *title* of your article; for example: the Four Years' Sejm 1788–1792.

Use commas in numerals containing more than three digits to distinguish them from years: 1,914.

h. Dates

Use the style 9 June 1999. Add (OS) if Old Style. Note also '55 BC' but 'AD 1453'. You are welcome to use BCE and CE instead of BC and AD.

i. Abbreviations

Use a full stop only if the last letter is not the last letter of the word, for example 'Dr', 'St', 'vols', but 'Co.', 'p.', 'vol.'. Note also 'no.' and 'nos.' (both have stops).

Do not use stops in the names of institutions, countries, books, journals, academic degrees and so on. For example, USA, CIS, USSR, UN, BBC, *KH*, *PSB*, PhD.

Use 'for example' instead of e.g., 'and so on' instead of etc. and 'that is' instead of 'i.e.'.

j. Punctuation

Do **not** hyphenate your document automatically using a wordprocessor: once typeset, your article will have different line-breaks but the hyphens will remain.

Use a **single** blank space after full stops at the end of sentences (not double).

Do **not** insert extra blank lines between paragraphs: use a tab mark to indent the first line of the paragraph.

In lists, **do not** insert a comma before the final 'and' ('German, Italian, French and Spanish libraries').

Place punctuation **outside** quotation marks (the 'tiger economies', for many years deemed...).

It is usually preferable to place footnote reference marks at the end of sentences rather than in the middle, but in any case footnote reference marks must appear

immediately after punctuation marks (commas, parentheses, full stops and so on), except for dashes.

Full stops come **after** parentheses unless the entire sentence is in parentheses.

k. Transliteration

All Cyrillic, Greek, Arabic, Hebrew and so on must be transliterated, except in quoted passages of prose or poetry where a particular point of style is being made. Where the original alphabet is used, it must be accompanied by an English translation immediately following, in inverted commas and in parenthesis within the commentary, or as indented text beneath a passage of indented quotation (see also, **Quotations**).

When transliterating Cyrillic, please use Table A below, based on the modified Library of Congress system as used in the *Slavonic and East European Review*.

When transliterating measures, use the nominative form rather than the genitive, regardless of what the usage of the language in question dictates. For example, десятъ десятин = ten *desiatiny*; десятъ вёрст = ten *versty*. This also applies in the Latin alphabet. For example, dziesięć groszy = ten *grosze*.

ABBREVIATIONS

AAN	— Archiwum Akt Nowych, Warsaw
AGAD	— Archiwum Główne Akt Dawnych, Warsaw
AGZ	— *Akta grodzkie i ziemskie z czasów Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z archiwum tak zwanego bernardyńskiego we Lwowie*, 25 vols, Lwów, 1868–1935
AHR	— *American Historical Review*
AIPN	— archiwum Instytutu Pamięci Narodowej
AP	— Archiwum Państwowe
APH	— *Acta Poloniae Historica*
ASWK	— *Akta sejmikowe województwa krakowskiego*, 5 vols, 1932–84
ASWP	— *Akta sejmikowe województw poznańskiego i kaliskiego*
BC	— Biblioteka Muzeum Narodowego im. Czartoryskich, Kraków
BJ	— Biblioteka Jagiellońska, Kraków
BK	— Biblioteka Polskiej Akademii Nauk, Kórnik
BN	— Biblioteka Narodowa, Warsaw
BO	— Biblioteka Zakładu Narodowego im. Ossolińskich, Wrocław
BPAU-PANKr	— Biblioteka Naukowa Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności i Polskiej Akademii Nauk, Kraków
BR	— Biblioteka Publiczna im. Edwarda Raczyńskiego, Poznań
CAW	— Centralne Archiwum Wojskowe
CDS	— *Codex diplomaticus nec non epistolaris Silesiae*, 3 vols, Wrocław, 1951–64
cf.	— compare
CPH	— *Czasopismo Prawno-Historyczne*
DN	— *Dzieje Najnowsze*
DNB	— *Dictionary of National Biography*
ed.	— editor(s)
EHR	— *English Historical Review*
f./ff.	— next page(s)
HJ	— *Historical Journal*
HZ	— *Historische Zeitschrift*
JMH	— *Journal of Modern History*
KDKK	— *Kodeks dyplomatyczny Katedry Krakowskiej*, ed. Franciszek Piekosiński, 2 vols, Kraków, 1874–83
KDM	— *Kodeks dyplomatyczny Małopolski*, Kraków, ed. Franciszek Piekosiński, 4 vols, Kraków, 1876–1905
KDMaz	— *Codex diplomaticus et commemorationum Masoviae generalis*, ed. Jan Korwin Kochanowski, Warsaw, 1919
KDP	— *Kodeks dyplomatyczny Polski*, 4 vols, Warsaw, 1847–87
KDW	— *Kodeks dyplomatyczny Wielkopolski*, 11 vols, Poznań, 1877–1999
KH	— *Kwartalnik Historyczny*
KHKM	— *Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej*
MGH	— *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*
MGH SrG	— *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum*
MGH SS	— *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, *Scriptores*
MK	— Metryka Koronna
MPH	— *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, 6 vols, 1864–93
MPH s.n.	— *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, *Series nova*, Kraków, 1946–
MS	— manuscript

ODNB	— *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*
OiRP	— *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce*
P&P	— *Past & Present*
PH	— *Przegląd Historyczny*
PL	— *Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina*, ed. Jacques Paul Migne, 221 vols, Paris, 1844–64
PSB	— *Polski Słownik Biograficzny*, 1935–
RDSG	— *Roczniki Dziejów Społecznych i Gospodarczych*
RevHist	— *Revue historique*
RH	— *Roczniki Historyczne*
RHum	— *Roczniki Humanistyczne*
RWHF PAU	— *Rozprawy i Sprawozdania z Posiedzeń Wydziału Historyczno-Filozoficznego Akademii Umiejętności*, Kraków, 1874–91
	— *Rozprawy Akademii Umiejętności. Wydział Historyczno-Filozoficzny*, Kraków, 1891–1918
	— *Rozprawy Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności. Wydział Historyczno-Filozoficzny*, Kraków, 1921
	— *Rozprawy — Polska Akademia Umiejętności. Wydział Historyczno-Filozoficzny*, Kraków, 1921–28/29
	— *Rozprawy Wydziału Historyczno-Filozoficznego — Polska Akademia Umiejętności*, Kraków, 1928/29–52
	— *Rozprawy Wydziału Historyczno-Filozoficznego — Polska Akademia Umiejętności*, Kraków, 1992–
SDRE	— *Studia z Dziejów Rosji i Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej*
SEER	— *Slavonic and East European Review*
SGKP	— *Słownik geograficzny Królestwa Polskiego i innych krajów słowiańskich*, 15 vols, Warsaw, 1880–1902
SH	— *Studia Historyczne*
SIRIO	— *Sbornik Imperatorskogo Russkogo Istoričeskogo Obŝestva*, 148 vols, Saint Petersburg, 1867–1916
s.l.e.a.	— without place or date of publication
Sobótka	— *Śląski Kwartalnik Historyczny 'Sobótka'*
SPPP	— *Starodawne Prawa Polskiego Pomniki*, 12 vols, 1856–1921
SRP	— *Scriptores Rerum Polonicarum*, 22 vols, Kraków, 1872–1917
SSS	— *Słownik Starożytności Słowiańskich*, 8 vols, Wrocław, 1961–96
St. Źr.	— *Studia Źródłoznawcze*
Urzędnicy	— *Urzędnicy Dawnej Rzeczypospolitej XII–XVIII Wieku. Spisy*, ed. Antoni Gąsiorowski, 1985–
Urzędnicy, Litwa	— *Urzędnicy Wielkiego Księstwa Litewskiego. Spisy*, ed. Andrzej Rachuba, 4 vols, Warsaw, 2003–09
VC	— *Volumina Constitutionum*, Warsaw, 1996–
VL	— *Volumina Legum*, 10 vols, Warsaw, 1732–1793
ZH	— *Zapiski Historyczne*

MODIFIED LIBRARY OF CONGRESS TRANSLITERATION

Cyrillic		Transliteration		Cyrillic		Transliteration	
А	а	A	a	О	о	O	o
Б	б	B	b	П	п	P	p
В	в	V	v	Р	р	R	r
Г	г	G	g	С	с	S	s
In Ukrainian and Belarusian		H	h	Т	т	T	t
Ґ	ґ	G	g	Ћ	ћ	Ć	ć
Ѓ	ѓ	Ǵ	ǵ	У	у	U	u
Д	д	D	d	Ў	ў	Ŭ	ŭ
Ђ	ђ	Đ	đ	Ф	ф	F	f
Е	е	E	e	Х	х	Kh	kh
Є	є	Ie	ie	In Serbo-Croat and Macedonian		H	h
Ё	ё	E	e	Ц	ц	Ts	ts
In Belarusian		Io	io	In Serbo-Croat and Macedonian		C	c
Ж	ж	Zh	zh	Ч	ч	Ch	ch
In Serbo-Croat		Ž	ž	In Serbo-Croat and Macedonian		Č	č
Ӂ	ӂ	J	j	Ш	ш	Sh	sh
З	з	Z	z	In Serbo-Croat and Macedonian		Š	š
S	s	Dz	dz	Щ	щ	Shch	shch
И	и	I	i	In Bulgarian		Sht	sht
In Ukrainian		Y	y	Ъ	ъ	″	″*
І	і	Ī	ī	In Bulgarian		Ă	ă*
In Ukrainian and Belarusian		I	i	Ы	ы	Y	y
Ї	ї	Ï	ï	Ь	ь	′	′
Й	й	I	i	Ѣ	ѣ	Ie	ie
Ј	ј	J	j	Э	э	E	e
К	к	K	k	Ю	ю	Iu	iu
Ќ	ќ	Ḱ	ḱ	Я	я	Ia	ia
Л	л	L	l	Ӂ	ӂ	Ŭ	ŭ
Љ	љ	Lj	lj	Ӈ	ӈ	Iŭ	iŭ
М	м	M	m	Ѳ	ѳ	F	f
Н	н	N	n	Ѵ	ѵ	Ẏ	ẏ
Њ	њ	Nj	nj	*Transliterated in middle of word. Disregarded when final.			